

consent of the Senate, it would very much expedite the procedures of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are Senators who are still disposed to make speeches, although they are not prepared to make them at this time, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 25, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 24, 1966:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1970.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The nominations beginning Clinton D. Upham, to be commander, and ending John K. Callahan, Jr., to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 10, 1966.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning David Gershowitz, to be captain, and ending Charles R. Polly, to be chief warrant officer, W-3, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 18, 1966.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, D.D., Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

"For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth," saith the Lord.—Isaiah 55: 10-11.

We thank Thee, O Lord, that as the snow settles upon the earth, so Thy word can settle in our minds and hearts. Grant, O God, that as that word penetrates our thinking, it may bring forth the fruit of wise decisions and right actions.

We thank Thee today for him who, over the last several years, has led this body so often in prayer. We thank Thee for his witness and continuing influence. Grant Thy blessing upon his loved ones. May they be comforted by their memories of his life, and by their hope for the life to come.

We pray for the Nation for whom he prayed so often. We love our Nation, Lord. We thank Thee for its ideal of "liberty and justice for all." We confess we have not fully achieved the ideal, but, O God, keep us always moving

in that direction. May no selfishness on our part, or lack of understanding, keep us from working for our Nation's welfare. We pray for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with an amendment to the bill S. 251, to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, in which concurrence of the House is requested.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126c, appointed Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. PROUTY to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194(a), appointed Mr. BASS and Mr. PEARSON to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

COMPENSATION OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING POSITIONS UNDER THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OVERSEAS TEACHERS PAY AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES ACT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, and disagree to the amendments of the Senate and request a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY, MORRISON, UDALL, CORBETT, and BROYHILL of North Carolina.

PROPER LAND USE PROMISES LASTING BENEFIT

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, in the rapidly expanding urban and industrial area around Atlanta, we have come to appreciate the importance of wise land use planning to protect the community's valuable soil and water resources, and for the long-term benefit of investors in the Atlanta economy.

The Atlanta region is experiencing the same land use problems as those found in other dynamic metropolitan areas in the Nation. The answers to these problems are much the same everywhere. They are based on proper evaluation of the soils; following through with development programs that the particular type of soil will adequately support; taking the necessary steps to protect against erosion from land under development, and stabilizing the soil immediately following development.

Local governments, institutions, and urban and industrial developers in the Atlanta region have wisely sought, and have received, expert help from qualified soil and water conservation technicians in planning the best possible use of land under development.

The Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the State of Georgia, has provided vital technical assistance on soil and water conservation problems. In the State as a whole, SCS soil scientists last year completed soil surveys on about 1,870,000 acres of land.

I am confident that soil surveys will be used increasingly in Georgia's Fourth District to determine the best possible use of the land in a developing economy; to protect the land from erosion, the rivers and streams in the area from siltation, and those who buy and build on the land from loss due to building on soil that is not suited to the purpose.

I heartily commend the Federal, State, and local cooperation which has made possible the soil surveys and other soil and water conservation measures in the Atlanta area and throughout Georgia's Fourth Congressional District. Through experience, we have come to appreciate the immense value of these services—for the lasting benefit of this important and rapidly growing region of the American Southland.

HEARINGS IN REGARD TO THE B-727 AIRPLANE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to announce that next Tuesday, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have before it in executive session the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to discuss the subject of the B-727 airplane.

All of us are aware that in the past few months there have been several regrettable accidents involving this type of aircraft. Many Members of the House have indicated to me their rightful concern over what has happened and what is being done to avoid repetition.

I wish to indicate that the formal investigations of the aviation authorities are going forward to determine what may have been the causes of the accidents and the steps that need to be taken to prevent

recurrence. The record is not yet complete and definitive conclusions have not yet been reached.

The committee has no desire to anticipate what may be the findings, nor jump to any hasty opinions. We cannot overlook, however, our responsibilities to the people and to the Members of the House in the field of aviation operations and safety, as to what, if anything, should be done in the meantime. Accordingly, we are having these executive meetings so that we may be assured ourselves and in turn assure the Members that the proper measures have been and are being taken adequately to protect the public.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE NORTHEAST POWER FAILURE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on the Investigation of the Northeast Power Failure be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANNED SPACE FLIGHT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR ADMIRAL NIMITZ

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time first to advise the House that memorial services for Admiral Nimitz will be held in the Washington National Cathedral at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, February 25.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Bandstra	Farnsley	Powell
Baring	Fisher	Reuss
Blatnik	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, S.C.
Burleson	Hagen, Calif.	Roudebush
Casey	Hansen, Iowa	Scott
Cederberg	Harvey, Ind.	Smith, Iowa
Chelf	Hébert	Taylor
Cohelan	Jacobs	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Kee	Toll
Derwinski	Martin, Ala.	Vigorito
Dorn	Matthews	Walker, Miss.
Dowdy	Miller	White, Idaho
Dyal	Moorehead	Willis
Edwards, La.	Pool	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 742, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 742

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the rule on H.R. 12169 providing for 3 hours of debate.

H.R. 12169 will authorize the appropriation of \$415 million in supplemental funds for the economic assistance program of the Agency for International

Development during the remainder of fiscal year 1966.

This authorization is essential to carry forward U.S. efforts to resist Communist aggression in South Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia and to build stability in the Dominican Republic. In addition, the authorization will replenish the contingency fund which provides funds to the President for use in unforeseen and emergency situations where vital U.S. interests are at stake.

H.R. 12169 provides \$315 million in new authority for supporting assistance, of which \$275 million is for Vietnam; \$15 million for Laos and Thailand; \$25 million for the Dominican Republic; and \$100 million for the contingency fund, for use in any part of the world where emergencies might arise.

There is a clear need for these funds. Appropriations now available for use in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are exhausted. The contingency fund is exhausted. In fact, AID has had to "borrow" from other funding categories to finance our efforts in Vietnam. These "borrowings" must be paid back.

I am assured by AID that there are no further sources of funds and, in fact, funds for Vietnam are dangerously low. Any delay or any cut in the authorization now before the House would seriously hinder our efforts to defeat the Communists in the crucial struggle for southeast Asia.

The \$275 million of supporting assistance for South Vietnam can be divided into two main elements. The first is \$175 million to finance commodity imports which will help to fight inflation. I think all my colleagues would agree rampant inflation poses a major threat to economic and political stability wherever it occurs. But in a war situation such as Vietnam, the effects are even more serious and an integral part of our program is designed to bring more goods into the economy to keep the forces of inflation in check.

The second major element of the program in Vietnam to be financed from the funds authorized in H.R. 12169 is \$100 million for counterinsurgency and rural construction. Included in these programs are public safety, logistic management, public works, refugee relief, agriculture and welfare, and development projects. As you can see from this brief listing, these funds will have a direct impact on the people of that war-torn land. These funds will support the outstanding work of the Agency for International Development in helping to build a better life and to give the Vietnamese hope for the future.

Approval of these funds will help support the military efforts in Vietnam and carry forward the pledge made in the declaration of Honolulu to win the crucial battle against disease, ignorance, and poverty in South Vietnam.

The expanded AID program in Vietnam entails increased administrative expenses. AID has estimated that approximately \$1.4 million will be required to meet recruitment costs and pay for other administrative and support services. Therefore, the committee has included authority to use up to \$1.4 million of

supporting assistance funds for administrative expenses incurred only in connection with Vietnam programs. This authority would require a determination by the President that such a transfer is necessary, which determination would be reported to the Congress.

The bill before the House also contains \$15 million to support counterinsurgency and rural development efforts in Thailand and Laos. The battle for these areas of southeast Asia has been increasing in tempo in recent months. Communist subversion is being stepped up and we must meet it.

H.R. 12169 thus will provide support for efforts to meet aggression and resist subversion in these key countries of southeast Asia—Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos. The funds being requested are small in comparison to our military efforts, but they are not less important.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House will help in the short-run struggle against communism and the long-run battle against the ancient enemies of man.

As President Johnson said in his foreign aid message to the Congress:

We extend assistance to nations because it is in the highest traditions of our heritage and our humanity. But even more because we are concerned with the kind of world our children will live in.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 12169, which will provide one more step toward a world of stability, peace, and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule is adopted, and I would now like to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a point on the rule?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and for his explanation of the bill which is to be considered here, H.R. 12169, as made in order by House Resolution 742. My question pertains to the rules of procedure of the House and particularly to lines 6 and 7 of the resolution, where "all points of order against that bill are hereby waived."

Would the gentleman from Massachusetts advise me, in his wisdom and that of the Committee on Rules, what there is in this bill that might be subject to a point of order and, secondly, who made the request that this be included in this rule and, thirdly, why it is good procedure under these particular circumstances?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Actually, I do not know where a point of order lies. All I do know is it is the procedure of the Committee on Rules, when we have a rule to write we tell the Parliamentarian and he writes it for us, and we go on from there. I do not know whether there is a point of order that lies against the bill. As I recall it, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said, having gone over the bill with the Parliamentarian, that he knew of no points of order but that they

thought it was best because of the importance of the bill that they waive points of order so, in case there is a technicality ruled against it, it would protect it.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. But, is the distinguished gentleman telling the House that the Committee on Rules does not write the rules under which we consider legislation in this House?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Of course, we have as an adviser on matters of this nature the Parliamentarian, as do all the Members of the House.

Mr. HALL. Is there any question in the gentleman's mind as to whether or not there is anything in this bill that is not germane? Was any point submitted that would require waiver of all points of order against the bill?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. No. I would submit there was not.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a poor way to legislate. We have adequate rules of procedure which are updated every 2 years and which have been our rules since the time of Jefferson for the handling of matters pertaining to rules of germaneness, the Ramseyer rule, and every other indication that we ordinarily concern ourselves with concerning points of order. If they are to come in here, as they did indeed yesterday, when we had a protest vote against the rule requested by the Committee on Ways and Means, and, if all supplementals or deficiencies and appropriations come in with waivers of points of order and "gag rules" preventing amendment—and this is a perfectly good rule here except for the waiver of all points of order—there are bound to be objections, no action "without objection," and none will be considered under unanimous consent, and I place the House on notice that there will be protest votes all along.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. All I can say to the gentleman from Missouri is that to my knowledge there are no points of order in this legislation. However, the committee felt that the bill was of such import that it did not want to take any chances, and so the waiver of points of order was placed in the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand what the gentleman from Massachusetts is saying—this was inserted by the Parliamentarian or by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it was passed routinely, without consideration by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. It was suggested by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. HALL. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is nothing in the bill itself that might be subject to a point of order?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. It was inserted by the Committee on Rules at the suggestion of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. HALL. Well, Mr. Speaker, the House in its wisdom can determine later whether the bill contains areas therein and whether it might be subject to a point of order. But with this resolution passing as written we have no right to work our will under these circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman presently in the well of the House, and the Committee on Rules, am I to believe now that it is becoming fashionable to simply write waivers of points of order in the rules clearing bills to the House floor?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. There was a request that this be done.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, is it just fashionable to do it?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Iowa was in the Committee on Rules when the debate transpired yesterday. The gentleman was there, and he knows that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs asked for this particular rule, after he had talked with the Parliamentarian. At that time the gentleman could have, if he so desired, opposed the rule and the granting of the waiving of points of order that the gentleman's chairman offered before the Committee on Rules, but the gentleman sat there mute.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, let us get the record straight. I sat immediately back of the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania said he did not know of any reason why points of order should be waived on the bill, and I thought that was sufficient.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. But, nevertheless, he asked for this rule.

Mr. GROSS. Who is "he" who asked for a waiver of points of order?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. I presume he was speaking for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Who is "he"? The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee? The chairman of that committee said that he was not asking that the points of order be waived.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. But Dr. MORGAN explained to us that he had requested the rule that was suggested to him, after he had consultation with the Parliamentarian. For that reason he was offering that rule, and that is why we adopted it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not know when that happened, and I insist he did not make such a request. If there is a rollcall vote on the rule I will vote against adoption for the reason that no case has been made for a waiver of points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 742 provides for a 3-hour rule for the consideration of H.R. 12169, which is a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of

1961. It does waive points of order, but it is open for amendment.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the appropriation of \$415 million for the remainder of fiscal 1966 to support U.S. operations in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and to build up the contingency fund. None of the money is for military assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the funds are intended for the following purposes: \$275 million for Vietnam, \$7.5 million for Laos, \$7.5 for Thailand, \$25 million for the Dominican Republic, and \$100 million for the contingency fund, which makes a total of \$415 million.

Mr. Speaker, of these funds for Vietnam, \$175 million will be used to import essential consumer goods and industrial materials required to keep the economy going. The remaining \$100 million is for the rebuilding of war-damaged villages, roads and bridges, increased refugee relief, and to finance increased counter-insurgency operations.

Mr. Speaker, the \$7.5 million for Laos will be used to finance a civilian air transport to outlying areas cut off from direct government contact, and to purchase the supplies carried in by the airlift.

Mr. Speaker, the \$7.5 million earmarked for Thailand is to be used to expand programs aimed at strengthening the exposed northeast area against Communist subversion from neighboring Laos just across the Mekong River. Training of local police improved communications and expanded health, education, and agriculture programs are planned.

Mr. Speaker, the bill provides \$25 million for the Dominican Republic. The sum of \$15 million will be used to help finance the Government and the remaining \$10 million is earmarked to continue such projects as road repairs, community development, and irrigation programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes \$100 million to be added to the contingency fund for use in the last 3 months of fiscal 1966. The funds are to meet unexpected needs, not known ones, or programs Congress has previously rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not have any requests for time but do reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to order the previous question.

The motion was agreed to.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks previously made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I was going to object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had declared the resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and I want to object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to be fair and wants to protect the rights of Members. Since the gentleman states that he was on his feet for that purpose, without objection the actions by which the resolution was agreed to and the motion to reconsider was laid on the table are vacated.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 11, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 22] YEAS—360

Abbott	Boland	Collier
Abernethy	Bolling	Colmer
Adair	Boiton	Conable
Adams	Bow	Conte
Addabbo	Brademas	Conyers
Albert	Bray	Corbett
Anderson, Ill.	Brock	Craley
Anderson, Tenn.	Brooks	Cramer
Andrews, George W.	Broomfield	Culver
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brown, Ohio	Cunningham
Annunzio	Broyhill, N.C.	Curtin
Arends	Broyhill, Va.	Curtis
Ashmore	Buchanan	Daddario
Aspinall	Burke	Dague
Ayres	Burton, Calif.	Daniels
Baldwin	Burton, Utah	Davis, Ga.
Baring	Byrne, Pa.	Davis, Wis.
Barrett	Byrnes, Wis.	de la Garza
Bates	Cabell	Delaney
Battin	Cahill	Denton
Beckworth	Callan	Derwinski
Belcher	Callaway	Devine
Bell	Cameron	Diggs
Bennett	Carey	Dingell
Berry	Carter	Dole
Betts	Chamberlain	Donohue
Bingham	Clancy	Dow
Boggs	Clark	Downing
	Clawson, Del.	Duiski
	Clevenger	Duncan, Oreg.

Duncan, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Reuss
Dwyer	Kornegay	Rhodes, Ariz.
Edmondson	Krebs	Rhodes, Pa.
Edwards, Ala.	Kunkel	Rivers, Alaska
Edwards, Calif.	Kupferman	Roberts
Ellsworth	Laird	Robison
Erlenborn	Langen	Rodino
Evans, Colo.	Latta	Rogers, Colo.
Everett	Leggett	Rogers, Fla.
Evins, Tenn.	Lennon	Ronan
Fallon	Lipscomb	Roncalio
Farbstein	Long, La.	Rooney, N.Y.
Farnum	Love	Rooney, Pa.
Fascell	McCarthy	Rosenthal
Feighan	McClary	Rostenkowski
Findley	McCulloch	Roush
Flood	McDade	Roybal
Flynt	McDowell	Rumsfeld
Fogarty	McEwen	Ryan
Foley	McFall	Satterfield
Ford, Gerald R.	McGrath	St. Germain
Ford, William D.	McMillan	St. Onge
Fountain	McVicker	Saylor
Fraser	Macdonald	Scheuer
Frelinghuysen	MacGregor	Schisler
Friedel	Machen	Schmidhauser
Fulton, Pa.	Mackay	Schneebell
Fuqua	Mackie	Schweiker
Gallagher	Madden	Secrest
Garmatz	Mahon	Selden
Gathings	Malliard	Shipley
Gettys	Marsh	Shriver
Glaimo	Martin, Ala.	Sickles
Gibbons	Martin, Mass.	Sikes
Gilbert	Martin, Nebr.	Sisk
Gilligan	Mathias	Skubitz
Gonzalez	Matsunaga	Slack
Gray	May	Smith, Calif.
Green, Oreg.	Meeds	Smith, N.Y.
Green, Pa.	Michel	Smith, Va.
Greig	Mills	Springer
Grider	Minish	Stafford
Griffin	Mink	Stagers
Griffiths	Minshall	Stalbaum
Hagen, Calif.	Mize	Stanton
Haley	Moeller	Steed
Halpern	Monagan	Stephens
Hamilton	Moore	Stratton
Hanley	Morgan	Stubblefield
Hansen, Idaho	Morris	Sullivan
Hansen, Wash.	Morrison	Sweeney
Hardy	Morse	Talcott
Harsha	Morton	Taylor
Harvey, Mich.	Mosher	Teague, Calif.
Hathaway	Moss	Tenzer
Hawkins	Murphy, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Hechler	Murphy, N.Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Helstoski	Murray	Thomson, Wis.
Henderson	Natcher	Todd
Herlong	Nedzi	Trimble
Hicks	Nelsen	Tuck
Holland	Nix	Tunney
Horton	O'Brien	Tupper
Hosmer	O'Hara, Ill.	Tuten
Howard	O'Hara, Mich.	Udall
Hull	O'Konski	Ullman
Hungate	Olsen, Mont.	Utt
Huot	O'Neal, Ga.	Van Deerlin
Hutchinson	O'Neill, Mass.	Vanik
Ichord	Ottinger	Vivian
Jacobs	Patman	Waggoner
Jarman	Patten	Walker, N. Mex.
Jennings	Pelly	Watkins
Johnson	Perkins	Watts
Johnson, Calif.	Philbin	Wetner
Johnson, Okla.	Pickle	Whalley
Johnson, Pa.	Pike	White, Tex.
Jonas	Pirnie	Whitener
Jones, Ala.	Poage	Whitten
Jones, Mo.	Poff	Widnall
Jones, N.C.	Price	Williams
Karsten	Pucinski	Wilson, Bob
Karth	Quie	Wolf
Kastenmeyer	Race	Wright
Keith	Randall	Wyatt
Kelly	Redlin	Wylder
Keogh	Rees	Yates
King, Calif.	Reid, Ill.	Young
King, N.Y.	Reid, N.Y.	Younger
King, Utah	Reifel	
	Reinecke	

NAYS—11

Andrews, Glenn	Gross	Pool
Ashbrook	Gurney	Quillen
Dickinson	Hall	Rogers, Tex.
	Passman	Watson

NOT VOTING—61

Ashley	Casey	Cleveland
Bandstra	Cederberg	Cohelan
Biatnik	Chelf	Cooley
Brown, Calif.	Clausen	Corman
Burleson	Don H.	Dawson

Dorn	Harvey, Ind.	Purcell
Dowdy	Hays	Resnick
Dyal	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Edwards, La.	Hollifield	Roudebush
Farnsley	Irwin	Scott
Fino	Kee	Senner
Fisher	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Fulton, Tenn.	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Goodell	Long, Md.	Toll
Grabowski	Matthews	Vigorito
Grover	Miller	Walker, Miss.
Gubser	Moorhead	White, Idaho
Hagan, Ga.	Multer	Willis
Halleck	Olson, Minn.	Wilson
Hanna	Pepper	Charles H.
Hansen, Iowa	Powell	Zablocki

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Cleveland.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Goodell.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
 Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kee.
 Mr. Multer with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Dowdy.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Chelf with Mr. Irwin.
 Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Casey.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Hanna.
 Mr. Matthews with Mr. Long of Maryland.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Teague of Texas.
 Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Farnsley.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Fisher.
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Purcell.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Resnick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12169, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12169 authorizes \$415 million of additional funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Most of this money is for Vietnam, and I believe it is fair to say that if it were not for the war in Vietnam, we would not have this bill before us.

Now I know that there are some of us who disagree with the policy our Government is following in Vietnam, but I do not believe that even those who disagree with our policy will find themselves in opposition to this bill.

As far as I am aware, none of the critics of our policy has advocated an immediate pullout of U.S. forces and termination of U.S. assistance.

I believe everyone will agree that as long as our boys are fighting in Vietnam, we must back them up, and, although this bill provides no military assistance, the funds which it authorizes are absolutely essential if the civilian population is to cope with the devastation of war and the demoralization caused by inflation in that country.

The funds authorized by this bill are to be used as follows:

For Vietnam.....	\$275,000,000
For Laos.....	7,500,000
For Thailand.....	7,500,000
For the Dominican Republic.....	25,000,000
To replenish the contingency fund.....	100,000,000
Total.....	415,000,000

VIETNAM

It is not necessary for me to describe the effect which the war has had on the economy of Vietnam. Villages, roads, and bridges have been destroyed. Crops have been damaged and the movement of rice to markets has been interrupted. The Government is not able to collect its normal revenues, and it needs more money than ever to carry on the war effort.

This bill authorizes funds to assist the rural population to deal with war devastation and to finance the import of additional supplies of very essential commodities. The sale of these commodities will absorb some of the rapidly expanding purchasing power resulting from the presence of U.S. personnel and the large-scale construction program made necessary to supply and to shelter our forces in that country.

At the same time, the proceeds of the sale of these commodities will augment the war budget of the Government of Vietnam.

As I pointed out a minute ago, there is no money in this bill for military assistance. The organization and procedures of the military assistance program are not designed to support combat operations. The Committee on Foreign Affairs agrees with the recommendation of the President that the supply of military equipment and services to the Vietnam forces should be at the discretion of our commander in the field and that the same logistics system should serve both United States and Vietnam forces while this present war is going on. Authorization of the funds to finance military equipment for the use of our own forces in Vietnam and for the Vietnamese forces is now under consideration by the Committee on Armed Services.

Just yesterday morning I appeared before the Committee on Rules at the same time the Armed Forces representatives appeared, and a rule was granted on their bill. I am sure under the leadership of the House, it will be up for discussion next week.

LAOS

The \$7,500,000 for Laos is needed primarily to meet the problems of supplying the civilian population of that war-torn country. There are a considerable number of refugees who have to be taken care of, and many villages inhabited by people who are strongly anti-Communist are cut off except for air transport. The United States finances civilian air transport to supply these people and the expansion of airport facilities in order to carry the load.

THAILAND

The Communist campaign of terrorism and subversion in Thailand has been accelerated, particularly in the northeast and the extreme south. The \$7,500,000 provided for Thailand is to finance the expansion of the civil police, including additional helicopters and a village radio network, and to extend the rural development program to more villages.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The funds authorized in the bill will provide \$25 million for the Dominican Republic. Most of it will go to pay salaries and other expenses to keep government services going until the revenues of the Government of the Dominican Republic can be restored, and the rest to finance such essential economic programs as road maintenance, repair of irrigation ditches, and community development.

CONTINGENCY FUND

The large item in this bill that is not programed is the contingency fund.

The bill authorizes \$100 million to replenish the contingency fund. Last summer, the President requested and Congress voted \$50 million for the contingency fund. This was the first time in 10 years that the Executive had asked for less than \$150 million for the contingency fund, although in some years the actual drawings on the contingency fund were substantially lower.

The \$50 million has not been enough to meet the demands on the contingency fund this year. It has all been programed, and the bill provides \$100 million to take care of unforeseen situations or to deal with problems which are known to exist but where the amount of money required cannot yet be determined.

The Congress has established the policy, which is accepted by the Executive, that the contingency fund will not be used to finance projects or operations which are already programed or for which Congress has refused to provide funds.

There is no way we can tell whether \$100 million will be enough or whether it will be too much. The Agency for International Development has in recent years made a good record of returning to the Treasury any unneeded portion of the contingency fund.

The committee believes that, considering the present world situation, it

is in the national interest to provide the full amount requested, with the understanding that if all the money is not needed, it will not be spent.

The expanded Vietnam program has increased the cost of administration to pay the salaries of additional personnel, to meet the cost of recruiting the limited number of people with the necessary qualifications who are available for service in Vietnam and provide the necessary office space, equipment, and rental of quarters.

Section 610(b) of existing law prohibits the use of the transfer authority or other discretionary authority contained in the Foreign Assistance Act to augment appropriations for administrative expenses. For this reason, an additional authorization is required for this purpose, and the bill makes \$1,400,000 available for such use.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is very, very important to our effort in South Vietnam. As I said before, no military assistance is provided in the bill, but it is important to carry on our effort there. I hope that the House will pass the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that this money is being requested and authorized on an "illustrative" basis, in that if the administration does not need this money for southeast Asia, it could be allocated to and spent in any other country in any part of the world where we have an AID program or even in countries where we do not have an AID program at the present time?

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure if the gentleman from Louisiana will read the hearings conducted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he will find that the President has already had to draw on funds temporarily unused to the amount of \$64 million to keep the program going. The money in this bill will have to replace what has already been drawn and spent. The money is actually needed right now.

Mr. PASSMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's response; but is it not true that this money in this bill is being requested on an "illustrative" basis, and that it is not earmarked for South Vietnam or any other country? It is not like all other foreign aid: It is on an "illustrative" basis and may be spent wherever the AID agency pleases? If it is not true, please point out where in this bill you have earmarked money for South Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. I have already pointed out to the gentleman from Louisiana that \$64 million is earmarked to replace funds already spent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is that provision in this bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It has already been spent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is there such a provision in this bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It has been explained in the hearings.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am talking about this specific bill. The program is on an "illustrative" basis. I have been handling the appropriations bill for this pro-

gram for a long, long time, and it is still on an "illustrative" basis. Funds in the annual appropriation and in this bill are not earmarked for any particular country. Also the contingency fund of \$100 million can be used in any country around the world. In fact, AID testified before my subcommittee that they may not need it and may not spend it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the chairman for yielding to me. Is it not a fact that the appropriation bill considered by the gentleman from Louisiana is also on an illustrative basis and that it does give transferability authority?

Mr. MORGAN. This particular authorization has been justified on the basis that the need exists in South Vietnam and in the neighboring countries of Laos and Thailand.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I always seem to get this monstrosity of a program through the House on that basis. But when you, the authorization committee, make it legal to appropriate on an illustrative basis, we have no other alternative other than to go along with such a flexible procedure.

This is just another piece of the giveaway program. If you earmark these funds for South Vietnam, I will vote for it and apologize to this House for making this statement. You are not going to earmark these funds, and AID will have the right to spend it wherever they please.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman, who has not always been a supporter of the program, has not been able to earmark it down through the years, I believe that what we must do is trust the administration now, as we have in the past.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman has made my point for me. I want to thank him for it. We understand it is not earmarked, and you have no assurance that 15 cents of it will be spent in South Vietnam, so far as the language of the bill is concerned.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman's own bill is always set up on an illustrative basis. I believe the chairman made a point that the money has already been borrowed from other areas in order to fund the activities in South Vietnam.

Mr. PASSMAN. I read the hearings, and I still do not know where the money has been spent. It is the same old cabbage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that if the contingency fund in the amount of \$100 million is approved it can be spent in Indonesia or on behalf

of Nasser or Sukarno, or in any other place around the world?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman understands the definition of "contingency fund." Of course, it can be used anywhere there are unforeseen emergencies, anywhere around the world. The gentleman knows, as I know, that in the bill of last year we established a special contingency fund for South Vietnam in the amount of \$89 million. It has all been allocated to that area. This is the reason why none of the \$50 million from the contingency fund was used in South Vietnam. The gentleman can be sure, without that special contingency fund for South Vietnam, the \$50 million would have been used in South Vietnam.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today presents a very serious question for many people, including myself, who have been critical of our foreign aid programs for many years. If this bill is to be supported—and I think it should be—it should be supported on the basis of the fact that we are in Vietnam. Whether we like it or not, we are there. If we are there, we should provide every resource, every facility for our fighting men there.

It may be said, perhaps, that in this bill we are being overgenerous. I think we are. In my judgment there is a place where this bill can be reduced and should be reduced. But we must not err on the side of denying any dollars to the activity in Vietnam which will lead to its speedier conclusion and may in any sense result in the saving of lives. Upon that sober basis, I think this legislation should be considered.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is not perfect. It is not without fault. It does not do many of the things that ought to be done. It leaves unanswered certain questions.

However, it is a step in the right direction and possibly, only possibly, the best step that we can take at this time. There are areas about which several of us on the committee who filed supplemental views were deeply concerned. First of all, we are concerned that ships of friendly nations, ships of countries to which we have given assistance, are even now continuing to carry goods and cargoes into North Vietnam, into the harbor at Haiphong. We feel something should be done about that, something far more than has been done and is being done.

Secondly, although we did not go into this in the supplemental views, we are aware that great delays are being encountered in the offloading of cargoes at Saigon and Da Nang and elsewhere. We think this is inexcusable. If, during World War II, we could, by the use of breakwaters and otherwise, unload fantastic amounts of cargo and great numbers of men onto the Normandy beaches in a combat situation, then there is absolutely no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for the fact that cargo ships are lined up waiting to be offloaded in Saigon and elsewhere in Vietnam. This, I say, is inexcusable.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, everyone who has visited Vietnam comes back with reports that there is a black market there. Admittedly, in a wartime economy, it is difficult to stop black-market operations, but if they cannot be stopped entirely, at least they can be limited. We who filed supplemental views suggested a means by which this could be done. We suggested that all civilian dependents be sent home. There are no civilian dependents there now of U.S. Government personnel, military and civilian, but there are some contractors' civilian dependents there. We have reason to believe that if these dependents were sent home, at least one type of black-market operation would be curtailed, if indeed not done away with completely.

Reference has been made to the contingency fund. For this fiscal year there was provided \$50 million, which was all committed or at least earmarked in the first 7 months of the fiscal year, none of it for Vietnam.

At the request of the President, special funds for southeast Asia were made available which were or are being used in Vietnam. Now we are asked to provide another \$100 million in contingency funds for the balance of this fiscal year. At the maximum this will only be 4 months. I think that is far too much. In a period when we are tightening our belts and we are trying to continue programs here at home and do a great deal for people abroad the contingency fund should be and can be severely limited. I am sure that an opportunity will be offered to the Members of this House to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude as I began by saying that although this bill before us is one which presents many questions and raises many doubts and leaves issues unanswered, if we take the position that the war in Vietnam must be won, if we take the position that we cannot deny anything which will contribute either directly or indirectly to victory there, then I think we must support this bill.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for his very excellent statement as to his reasons for supporting this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169.

I fail to see how Congress could do otherwise, any more than it could fail to authorize payment of the water bill for the fire department while it was in the midst of attempting to stamp out dangerous fires in many parts of the city.

The bill before us today is emergency legislation. It is designed to authorize the expenditure of \$415 million in tax dollars, most of it to be spent in the short space of the next 4 months, in order to repair the damages caused in many parts of the world by ignorance, by unconcern, by miscalculation and misunderstanding.

It even provides an additional \$100 million for our \$50 million "petty cash drawer" in case dollars are needed to

sprinkle on other brush fires which might erupt in any part of the world.

I am sure that the Congress will enact this bill into law rapidly, as it should. This money is needed, and quickly, in such places as South Vietnam, Laos, the Dominican Republic and Thailand.

But throwing dollars at our problems is not a solution to them, no matter how many dollars we have and however tempting this solution may appear. The best that dollars can buy is time. The worst is complacency and the failure to even see problems as they develop.

We need more fire prevention as well as fire control in the world, and we can't have it unless and until we start using these dollars as tools to implement foreign policy rather than as replacements for a foreign policy.

Unfortunately, the funds we are authorizing today are not tools, not implementations, but payments for mistakes. Let us hope we have fewer of them in the future.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. Will the gentleman in the well please give me a few hypothetical illustrations on which this money from the \$100 million contingency fund could be spent?

Mr. ADAIR. I think the chairman of the committee answered that a little earlier. I could only use generally the same illustrations. A contingency fund is, as its name implies, a fund to be used for unseen eventualities. We in the Congress and particularly in the House and those of us on the Committee on Foreign Affairs have been in the past—and I count myself among those—particularly critical of the way that the contingency fund can be used, but there are—and I will say to the gentleman very few—limitations, as long as it falls within the broadest outlines of foreign aid, on the manner in which this fund can be used. It can be used for situations which arise, for example, in a country which is newly threatened with revolt. It can be used for problems which present themselves in the field of education or matters of that sort. It is subject to the very widest use.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman heard the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for foreign aid. Is it accurate that these funds are not tied down or that this authorization of funds is not tied down to Vietnam?

Mr. ADAIR. It is true that by the terms of this bill it is not tied down to Vietnam nor indeed to southeast Asia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. ADAIR. Let me continue. However, if you read the record of the hearings, and if you consult the report, there is no question as to the intent. Since the gentleman has opened the question let me state that we are acting upon

this as a measure apart from some money for the Dominican Republic, a measure basically for southeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Accordingly, I would think that the administration which has presented it to the Congress in that way as a measure to contribute to stability in southeast Asia would feel bound to use it for that purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, why would not the administration have this in this bill?

Mr. ADAIR. That is a question which the gentleman, I believe, should address to the author of the bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am quite interested in this question.

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am very happy to point out that of the money which has been earmarked, \$275 million of this request has been justified on the basis of its need in South Vietnam.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, but—no, no, if I could interrupt there just a minute. You are not responsive to the issue. You say "earmarked," and that struck my interest.

But then you go on, as has just been talked about, and say something else. I want to find out why it is not actually tied down and actually earmarked by language, and not on the basis of just these statements.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will yield further, it has never been earmarked in such fashion in any of the history of the foreign aid bill. During the history of the foreign aid bill it has never been specifically earmarked.

Mr. CURTIS. I know, and that is one of the troubles with this bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Or any other appropriation.

Mr. MORGAN. Or in the appropriation bill. The gentleman from Missouri wants to change the rules on matters of this kind.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe that is one reason our foreign aid programs have been so poor, if I may draw that conclusion. Certainly, to come here at a time when we are in war over there, and say that this is for Vietnam and if you expect to get the vote on the assurance that that is what it is, I certainly believe that this rule should be changed and we should tie it down.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if I will vote for this unless it is tied down, because I have seen instances in these programs and I am about to conclude that the administration does not follow what it says in those examples which it gives as to where the money is to be spent. We could not rely upon this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. I say in response to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri that it is my understanding we will have an opportunity to connect these more closely and explicitly with Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will a possible amendment be offered?

Mr. ADAIR. I understand that such is the case.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to develop one other point, if I may. I was trying to find—and I have not had an opportunity to look through all of the hearings, although I have read the report—I was interested in seeing what balances we have not just in the foreign aid funds, but Public Law 480 funds, and how this money that we recently voted for the Asian Bank, which I hope will be available particularly in Vietnam, how this is coordinated. But I find no discussion of it contained in the report. As I stated earlier, insofar as I have been able to ascertain from the report, and I have not read the hearings, there has been no interrogation on this point.

Could the gentleman tell me whether the committee did go into all aspects of financing that is available in Vietnam, not just through this bill, but through the use of Public Law 480 funds, the lending that might be available in the Asian Bank, and so forth?

Mr. ADAIR. Having in mind the great multiplicity of lending institutions that are available for activities here and elsewhere, I would have to say to the gentleman, it would be almost impossible to go into all of them. Some of them do not even come within the purview of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We did give some consideration—perhaps not enough—to the general subject.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would permit me to make this observation before he yields further, it seems to me that is what we would expect the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do even though it is not within their jurisdiction—at least to have a knowledge of the funds that would be going in to hit at the same problem so at least there would be some consensus of this whole problem that the House could consider.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. There is a complete report on all of the expenditures available for all Members. But if I might follow up what the gentleman from Indiana has already said and nail it down, we are talking about funds primarily to be used in Vietnam. For instance, the \$100 million of this request is for additional economic assistance that will be used for rural construction and counterinsurgency activities. AID needs \$175 million for Vietnam to help finance the import of essential commodities in order to help combat inflation.

Rice imports needs \$21 million.

Medicines and pharmaceuticals requires \$9 million.

Needed for petroleum products, \$12 million.

Needed for iron and steel, \$50 million.

Needed for fertilizer imports, \$4.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, over half of these commodities will be utilized in areas outside of Saigon. All of the \$275 million is pinpointed for use in Vietnam.

Mr. CURTIS. In what way is this tied down? This is simply a statement. How can the Congress know that this actually is the way this money will be spent?

Mr. GALLAGHER. We would assume, of course, that the administration is telling the truth, as we have during all the time that we have had this program in operation.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further just for this observation, that is the whole point that the gentleman from Louisiana made, as I understand it, and to the extent that I have been able to study this matter of expenditures, the administration—and this is not just this administration, it was true in the Eisenhower administration as well.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. There was not this kind of followthrough on how they spent the money.

Mr. GALLAGHER. There has been that kind of followthrough and that is why we have confidence that the money will be properly used.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, the gentleman is saying that he feels I am in error in concluding that there has not been a followthrough?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes; I would conclude that the gentleman is in error if he says that there has not been a followthrough on this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] raised the question of committee consideration of the Southeast Asian Development Bank. That was subsequent to the hearings held by the committee on this bill. Moreover, we are never consulted by the Committee on Banking and Currency, so far as I know, with respect to financing any of these wonderful giveaways around the world that they get into.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell us whether or not there is any existing statutory authority at the present time to permit the President or someone to order the dependents of the U.S. citizens back home?

Mr. ADAIR. The President in my opinion has the authority. I think there is no doubt about it. It has been exercised, I am told, in a number of instances.

Mr. CAHILL. Can the gentleman advance any logical reason as to why this authority would be utilized as far as military personnel are concerned and not so far as civilian dependents are concerned.

Mr. ADAIR. Not at all. That is the point I was trying to make earlier and I appreciate the gentleman's concurrence in my views.

Mr. CAHILL. I think the gentleman is making an excellent point. One of the things that I have observed is that there is a tremendous housing shortage in Saigon particularly. I think this is one of the elements involved in the black market and certainly it is something that needs looking into. I think the gentleman has made a very valuable contribution to the discussion of these problems.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to point out that all civilian personnel of the Government have been ordered home. The only civilian personnel remaining there, or family of personnel, are the wives and families of the private contractors who are there.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for his constructive criticism. I have always had a great deal of respect for his position in this regard and for his sincere endeavor. I would like to ask the gentleman a question at this point. Is it not true that the criticism that you have brought out on the floor at this time regarding civilian dependents and supplies was thoroughly discussed by us in the consideration of this bill and that at the present time we have the statements to the effect that the supplies have been speeded up and that we might take up the problem of civilian dependents?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentlewoman is correct. Efforts are being made. My point is that they are tardy and far too little. If we can get cargoes across beaches under combat conditions, I see no reason why we cannot do the same in areas where there is no danger of aerial attack.

Mrs. KELLY. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I think we sometimes tend to forget, when we talk about AID appropriations, and funding, and economic development, and all the other technical jargon, that at the grassroots, out where the action is, the AID program means people at work—dedicated people; people with a job to do; people who get tired and scared and shot at, and worried, and who keep right on doing their jobs the best way they can. I would like to tell you about just one of these men I met during my recent trip to Vietnam.

I spent 1 day in the Mekong Delta with the U.S. operations mission there. I could not get in the area I was supposed to visit because they were afraid for my

safety. The man running that area was Eduardo Navarro.

Eduardo Navarro is a retired U.S. Army colonel. He knows how to use a gun if he has to but he does not carry one. He is a civilian working for the Agency for International Development as a Provincial representative in Vietnam near the Cambodian border. He is concerned with the welfare of 250,000 Vietnamese in an area infested with Vietcong. After being ambushed several times on the road to Saigon, he finally gave up driving. He has had several narrow escapes from daytime bombings in the streets of the city.

The villagers regard Ed Navarro as their friend. He works closely with the Province chief and American and Vietnamese military personnel to improve life in the Province while maintaining the best possible security. About 30 of his villages are considered secure and have qualified for Government help by routing out the Vietcong and agreeing to carry out self-help projects.

He is proud of the more than 100 schools which have been built by the village parents with cement and roofing supplied by AID. Nearly 200 teachers have been trained in short courses. Several clinics have been built and stocked with medical supplies from the AID commodity import program. Occasionally, the Vietcong steal them but the people know where they come from.

He uses his warehouse of food-for-peace wheat, oils, and dried milk as payment for work to benefit the community and make life worth fighting for.

On a demonstration farm 2 miles out of town, production is being increased by use of fertilizer and new seed. The Provincial hospital has a new surgical wing built by AID, staffed by a team of Filipino doctors and nurses paid by their own Government.

In fact, no aspect of life is overlooked. All the resources of AID in Vietnam are available to Eduardo Navarro to help the Vietnamese people build a better life. Not many Americans will ever hear of Ed Navarro or of his counterparts in every Vietnamese Province. But we in the Congress must not only know of what they are doing, we must support them. Perhaps this war cannot be won by civilians armed with seed, cement, and goodwill, but neither can it be won without them.

I believe the budget requests for AID are minimal and I call for their speedy approval.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would address a question to the chairman of the committee, if I might have his attention. This bill, as I understand it, and as I believe the Members of the House understand it, is to provide additional funds for economic aid to the Vietnamese and contiguous territory, plus \$25 million for the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MORGAN. Plus \$100 million for the contingency fund.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. But is not the bill designed for the purpose of aid to Viet-

nam? There is nothing whatever for the military effort.

Mr. MORGAN. Seventy percent of the funds in the bill are designed to support the war effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. Then why should we be dealing in this supplemental with any other areas other than those enumerated in the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. We are not. That is my opinion. I understand that all of the supplemental appropriations requested in this bill are for areas that are of vital importance to the security of this country.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the distinguished chairman agree with me that there is nothing whatever in the language of this bill that holds its provisions to Vietnam or any other specific place in the world?

Mr. MORGAN. As the gentleman knows, this is a supplemental authorization and is an amendment to the regular foreign aid bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; it is an addition to the regular foreign aid bill.

Mr. MORGAN. This is the procedure. Any other method would require us to bring out a separate AID bill for South Vietnam. Is that what the gentleman is suggesting? This is an amendment to the regular AID bill.

Mr. GROSS. I think a substantial number of the Members of the House are willing to vote for a bill today supplementing the foreign aid appropriations where such funds are designated for the purpose of doing something about aiding and bringing about a successful conclusion of the Vietnamese situation and sorry state of affairs in the Dominican Republic. It will be my purpose later on to offer an amendment to the bill to restrict the expenditures to those areas. It will be my further purpose to move to strike out all of the contingency fund increase, and I will argue that point later, because as the supplementary views in the report clearly show, not one dime of the \$50 million previously appropriated—and this was the statement of the distinguished chairman before the Rules Committee yesterday—was used in Vietnam. So it is incredible that we should be called upon today to provide \$100 million to beef up the contingency fund when we are dealing with a bill specifically designed to take care of the situations in the Dominican Republic, in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it the gentleman's intention, on Tuesday next, when H.R. 12335 comes to the House, containing approximately \$4 billion for military use in southeast Asia planning, to do the same thing and to pinpoint it in the same way?

Mr. GROSS. There is a great difference between military assistance and the giveaway program.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not believe there is. It is all part of the same thing.

Mr. GROSS. Especially when the giveaway program can go to any country in the world under the terms of this bill—to any country in the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it the gentleman's intention to pinpoint each item in the military authorization for Vietnam?

Mr. GROSS. Surely the gentleman is not trying to compare military assistance with this bill, which happens to come from the committee of which I am a member. I know a little something about this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is making an argument about the economic portion of the bill, but I still would like to have an answer to my question in regard to military funds authorized for the same area.

Mr. GROSS. I happen to know something about this bill. I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee and, therefore, I cannot say that I know as much about military assistance needs in the areas covered by this bill.

Does the gentleman know about the military bill? I shall be glad to support amendments, if the gentleman will offer them, with regard to military assistance, if he can find anyplace where we are going to give military assistance to anyone outside the southeast Asia area unless that country is fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has no intention to offer amendments. What I am trying to say to you, Mr. Gross, is that I have confidence in my President. When he says he is going to spend \$275 million in Vietnam I have confidence that he is going to spend it in Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. Then suppose you tell me what happened to the \$50 million in the contingency fund which was expended last year? Suppose you tell me where the President is going to use the \$100 million in 120 days or less. Suppose you give me some idea as to that.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Gross, there was a contingency fund every year of the Eisenhower administration and every year since, and not one dime of this authorization has ever been programmed in advance. If you will allow me the time, I will read that information into the Record.

Mr. GROSS. No; the gentleman controls ample time for that.

Mr. MORGAN. As to all of the expenses since 1956.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute, now. You have ample time or time of your own.

Mr. MORGAN. And not one dime out of the contingency fund has been programmed. You know the definition of "contingency fund" and I know it. It is for unforeseen emergencies.

I do not know today where one dime of this money is going to be spent, and I do not believe the administration does.

Mr. GROSS. We put \$50 million into the contingency fund last year.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; and I know where every dime of it was spent. So do you.

Mr. GROSS. Let us get it in the Record.

Mr. MORGAN. You know and I know that security is involved, and we cannot introduce it in the Record.

Mr. GROSS. Much of it ought to go in the Record. Much of it should not

be classified. It should be made available to the people who pay the bills.

Mr. MORGAN. You know very well that it cannot be put in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. You know that there is plenty of it that ought to be put in the RECORD.

I believe we ought to take a look at the help we are not getting in Vietnam these days, along with the tremendous expenditure of money we are making and being called upon to make under the terms of this bill.

So far as I know, there are only three countries—Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea—which are supplying any combat troops at all. New Zealand is supplying one battery of artillery. Australia is supplying a battalion of combat troops. And South Korea, on the basis of the last information I have is supplying a division of combat troops.

I have not seen any figures with regard to casualties of Koreans. I suppose they are engaged somewhere in Vietnam, but the newspapers do not provide us with the casualty figures insofar as the Koreans, the Australians, and the New Zealanders are concerned.

Otherwise they are deeply gratified—as Henry Cabot Lodge said when he appeared before the committee not too long ago—the other countries of the world are deeply gratified that we are doing the fighting and dying in Vietnam, along with the South Vietnamese.

Let us consider the Philippines, for instance. At present the Philippines have 70 personnel in Vietnam. These consist of military and civilian medical teams and a military psychological warfare detachment. Would one not believe that the Philippines could make some kind of combat contribution to the war in Vietnam, to some of the fighting and dying going on over there?

Japan has provided over \$55 million worth of economic assistance to Vietnam. This is money. We are talking about money exclusively now. This is reparations money they owe the Vietnamese as a result of their defeat in World War II that they would pay under any circumstances. Yet the State Department has the colossal gall to hand out a statement of this kind indicating that the Japanese are making a contribution in Vietnam when they give them \$55 million of money which they owe them as reparations for damage when they occupied the country in the last war.

You talk about having confidence in people. Let us have a decent and a fair story from some of these people in the State Department and in the White House.

Greece has contributed medical supplies. I do not know how much. This is the State Department report which says Greece has contributed medical supplies. I hope it is remembered that we put a lot of money into Greece in other years, yet we get no real help in stopping communism elsewhere.

Turkey has provided medicines and has also offered to provide some cement. Some cement—no troops.

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Vietnam and has dispatched a medical team.

Hundreds of millions of American dollars are going into India, a country that had 5 million or more under arms in World War II yet it will not provide a single combat soldier to help us out in Vietnam. India has provided cloth for flood relief, says the State Department, and has under study the creation in Vietnam of a factory for the preparation of tea and another for sugar so they will have tea with their sugar and sugar with their tea. This is within the framework of a program of technical assistance and economic cooperation. India is also considering providing equipment for what? For a blood transfusion center. They do not offer to give any blood, but will provide the center for somebody else to give their blood. How nice. Pakistan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me the additional time.

Pakistan has contributed some financial relief for flood victims, and it, too, donated some clothing to Vietnam. No troops.

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies and has offered to train Vietnamese in Israel in various fields, whatever that means. No troops.

Belgium provided medicines. How much? The State Department does not say. No troops.

Canada is providing a professor of orthopedics at Saigon University. A big help. Also about 200 scholarships both academic and technical. They are also providing about \$150,000 worth of flour. If I remember correctly, Canada has been selling about \$400 million worth of wheat a year to Red China, but they cannot afford to get into Vietnam on a bloodletting basis. So, no troops. I almost forgot—Canada has agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Vietnam's Hue University.

Denmark has provided medical supplies and is willing to train Vietnamese nurses in Denmark. No troops.

France since 1956, says the State Department, contributed \$111 million in assistance to South Vietnam. That is since 1956. A big contribution. No troops.

Germany has provided 12 personnel in Vietnam and has agreed to provide 14 more for a total of 26. They, too, are providing a large amount of help. No troops.

Ireland has contributed 1,000 pounds to Vietnam through their Red Cross. No troops.

Italy, where we have dumped more billions of dollars—and I mean billions—have provided a nine-man surgical team and are providing science scholarships. No troops.

The Netherlands. The Dutch have given antibiotics. No troops.

Spain has provided 800 pounds of medicines and has agreed to send a military medical team to Vietnam. No troops.

Switzerland, the home of a lot of our gold and bank accounts. I wish there were some way we could find out how

many of the black marketeers and corruptionists in Vietnam have unnumbered bank accounts in Switzerland as well as some other people. However, the Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. No troops.

Now we get down to Britain, which is threatening to invade little Rhodesia and bring that friendly country to its knees. In one of the most outrageous enterprises in the history of this country, President Johnson has joined the British in their boycott of Rhodesia. The British have provided six civilians for the British advisory mission in Vietnam and a professor of English at Hue University. With 8 Vietnamese already in training in England, Britain has agreed to provide for 12 more this year.

That is the British Empire or what is left of it. They are perfectly willing, apparently, if all else fails and they are losing their boycott of Rhodesia—they are perfectly willing it seems to send two divisions there to beat that little country down and stir up more ferment and more trouble in Africa in the process. Apparently the explosion and massacres in Nigeria have not given the United States enough to handle for awhile, so this administration has to help stir up more trouble in Rhodesia.

Now getting to Latin America, the Argentines have sent two observers to Vietnam to examine the possibilities for Argentine assistance. They are going to send some observers down to find out whether there is any place for them to do any fighting or dying in Vietnam.

Brazil has provided coffee and medical supplies. No troops.

In the Dominican Republic they are having their own troubles, but they have offered some cement.

So it goes around the world where we have frittered away at least \$130 billion trying to buy friends and influence people. Yes, as Lodge reports, most of the rest of the world is deeply gratified that we are fighting and financing the war in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, there are some who may be reluctant to approve further public funds for non-military purposes in South Vietnam until they are assured that private philanthropic agencies are also given a full opportunity to assist. Let me assure the members of this committee that private philanthropic groups are giving valuable assistance in South Vietnam. Their story is a noble one, that deserves to be told.

A recent on-the-spot survey by representatives of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service reported that "the refugee situation in Vietnam is in good hands." They found 43 voluntary agencies with either operational or supporting interest in Vietnam. Their varied programs are supplementing that of the Government of Vietnam and the Agency for International Development. These nongovernmental groups serve special needs and establish direct person-to-person relationships where Government programs cannot

operate so easily. Twenty-eight private agencies were running refugee relief programs.

For example: CARE is distributing packages financed by donations of the American people, including school supplies, tools, and seeds; needle trade kits to accompany sewing machines, and rice, salt, and fish, purchased locally.

Catholic Relief Services is expanding its services by 2 percent for school lunch programs, family feeding stations, and relief of war victims. It will quadruple its shipments of medicines, expand its vocational schools and cooperatives, and increase orphanages and social welfare services.

Church World Service took part in the initial refugee program in 1954 when 800,000 Vietnamese fled south. It has returned to Vietnam to serve the new influx of refugees, providing nurses and medical units, community development and agricultural teams, and some supplies for direct relief.

Other church-related agencies providing similar services and supplies include the Christian Children's Fund, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Mennonite Central Committee. Other agencies with special competence are helping with the blind, lepers, orphans, foster parents, public health, and rural electrification.

The International Rescue Committee, in cooperation with AID, has accepted the responsibility for six medical teams to be assigned to refugee areas. Leading American drug companies already have donated a substantial supply of drugs for civilian use, and the Medical Civic Action Program will distribute them throughout Vietnam.

International Voluntary Services has been operating a program in Vietnam since 1957. Under an AID contract, IVS has 50 young men serving throughout the rural regions, working on projects in agriculture, science education, teaching English, and in work with youth and refugees.

The number of refugees will soon exceed a million, and will seriously tax the resources of all agencies. The most pressing need, according to the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, is for more personnel. Supplies there are, but people are needed to help in the camps where 450,000 refugees are now being cared for, and in the villages to which they return or are resettled. Doctors, nurses, administrators, social welfare, and community development experts are wanted on short- and long-term assignments both by voluntary agencies and by AID.

In spite of all the difficulties, the refugee problem in Vietnam is being handled with vigor, and great self-sacrifice. I, for one, want to see that every cent of the AID request is provided for this vital work.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment and commend the gentleman from Utah for pointing out to

the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and to the country, the splendid effort being made by the private, voluntary, and religious organizations in Vietnam and in the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would add to the remarks of the gentleman, if I may, that our Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements has studied the scope of organizational contributions to human betterment, in the areas of economic well-being, education, health, and all others. Our study fully corroborates what the gentleman has reported about the voluntary agency and religious group effort to help in South Vietnam. The report shows that there are several thousand such organizations in the United States helping throughout the entire world, and it is estimated that such private assistance amounts to about \$600 million a year.

This represents a substantial and knowledgeable effort on the part of U.S. citizens to express their interest in the welfare and freedom of other people of the world.

This is a story which ought to be told more frequently. It is a story that all of the American people ought to understand and in which they ought to take great pride.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation because I believe it is necessary that the U.S. Congress provide all necessary funds for Vietnam and southeast Asia.

We people on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House have had adequate hearings and have discussed this legislation and the need for it. I would say to the House, I believe this is a good bill and should be passed so that there will be adequate supplemental foreign assistance authorization for the fiscal year 1966 under H.R. 12169.

I have several amendments I think should be placed in the legislation. The first one refers to the \$25 million for the Dominican Republic which is shown on page 3 of the section-by-section analysis of H.R. 12169.

I recommend that item should be specifically made by the United States not as a grant, but on a loan basis. The reason being this item is not just for current expenses but is to help on capital budget costs in the Dominican Republic. Capital expenditures should as a policy be advanced on a short- or long-term basis.

As a matter of fact, in the hearings we had the statement from Mr. Bell of AID as follows:

Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development, to technical assistance and to more permanent construction and long-range efforts to establish a stronger economy in the Dominican Republic.

When the purpose of the \$25 million is for longtime capital purpose, then I believe Congress should specify it should be on a loan.

But you say to me—FULTON, are we going to be depriving the Dominican Republic Government of needed assistance? The answer is "No."

If you will look at page 20 of the committee hearings, you will find that since the date of the revolution which occurred on April 24, 1965, through January 10, 1966, the great U.S. Government and the greater U.S. taxpayers have put in \$86.3 million as grants to the Dominican Republic. These were supporting assistance grants for Government operations and maintenance.

In addition to that, there is \$50 million current 1966 authorized money in the President's contingency fund plus \$4.1 million carryover from 1965. I am not allowed to give you the details of it, but there is an allocation of \$37.3 million to the Dominican Republic out of \$54.1 million remaining in that contingency fund as of this time. That is not obligation—that is allocation. So that adding the \$86.3 million makes a total of \$123.6 million that the United States is providing now to the Dominican Republic.

The President now proposes to add \$25 million more as a grant. So this addition will mean since April 24, 1965, U.S. grants of \$148,622,000.

I believe that is one of the highest rates of grants we have ever had to a country of this size.

But you say to me—How about the present loans of the Dominican Republic? They have some loans under 1 year—\$30 million worth of loans due under 1 year. Those loans are owed to foreign banks. So we in Congress are just simply going to pick up the \$25 million of commercial foreign bank loans.

The Dominican Republic Government owes \$153.5 million on loans that are from 1 to 8 years maturity. The United States could make a 40-year loan to the Dominican Republic with 1-percent interest for 10 years, and 2½-percent interest for 30 years. This type of loan is authorized under present Federal acts. So that if the United States gives the Dominican Republic \$25 million as a loan on a long-term basis, they are not in such bad shape, as the United States has really given wonderful help to the Dominican people as follows:

U.S. assistance to the Dominican Republic, Apr. 24, 1965, to Jan. 10, 1966

Supporting assistance grants for Government operations and maintenance..... \$86,300,000

Administered through OAS... 57,000,000
Administered through AID... 29,300,000

Approximately \$40 million of these funds have been used to pay salaries of employees who were on Government payrolls, or were employed by municipalities or Government-owned corporations before April 24, 1965; \$12 million was made available to the Government-owned sugar corporation through a loan by the Organization of American States. The balance was provided for disaster relief including food and medical supplies and emergency public works activities which are being undertaken by the provisional Government and AID.

Technical assistance grants totaled-----	\$4,438,000
Agriculture-----	941,000
Education-----	396,000
Transportation-----	212,000
Public administration-----	1,161,000
Community development-----	128,000
Other projects-----	1,600,000
Development loans authorized:	
National Housing Bank-----	5,000,000
Food for peace-----	7,858,000
Title II emergency program-----	3,007,000
Title III approved fiscal year 1966-----	4,851,000

Another question you should ask me is who are the creditors of the Dominican Government and to whom are those loans owed? Obligations from 1- to 8-year maturity are owed to the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank, and the U.S. Treasury.

On loans over 8 years, obligations of the Dominican Republic Government are owed to the International Bank, AID, Export-Import Bank, and to the U.S. Treasury under Public Law 480, title IV.

Why should the United States adopt a business basis and free enterprise policy toward the Dominican Republic at this time? The reason is that the Dominican Government is holding many businesses that are now Government owned and Government operated. These businesses are being operated at a deficit. The Dominican economic situation is this. First, there is a low rate of savings and investment. Nobody much in the Dominican Republic is saving or trying to help their government by avoiding inflation and seeking stable economic conditions.

Second, the Dominican exports are still being emphasized on commodities like sugar and cocoa which are in great oversupply at the present time and low priced on the international markets. The Dominicans have not changed their agricultural programs to realism and effective demand. This should be done at once both at home and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Let us face it. Too large a share of the economy of the Dominican Republic is owned and operated by the Government at a loss. If we will simply insist in this Congress that the Dominican Republic change over and make immediate plans for changing to a private economy, the U.S. taxpayers will be much better off, rather than financing indefinitely the \$5 million a month Government deficit, and deficiencies in foreign trade because of inflation at home and continued deficits caused by excessive imports compared to exports.

My other point is this: I propose to offer an amendment to cut the President's contingency fund for from \$150 million, which it would be if Congress adds \$100 million more under this bill, to \$100 million total for the 3-month period to the end of the current fiscal year or June 30, 1964. As has been

pointed out, this contingency fund will be spent over a 3-month period—over April, May, and June of this year—so that if the President has \$50 million added on by this bill as I propose he will be getting undesignated contingency funds at the rate of \$200 million a year. This is in addition to the \$89 million special contingency fund for southeast Asia we in Congress have given the President for use in this current fiscal year, which is all the President asked.

In the current fiscal year we have in the contingency fund \$50 million currently authorized and appropriated, and allocated but not yet obligated. In this fiscal year 1966 we have also \$4.1 million of contingency funds carried over from 1965. That means a total of \$54.1 million presidential contingency funds on hand now, of which about \$37 million has been allocated to the Dominican Republic and the rest to other places, which I should not give specifically.

My amendment will give the President \$50 million more for the remaining 3 months of this fiscal year, until June 30, and I believe that is enough. If it is any larger, if the crisis anywhere abroad is any larger, I believe the President should come to Congress and get an authorization.

So I would say to this House of Representatives that we should hold the purse strings and watch expenditures closely. We should not move this contingency fund back up to the \$200 million contingency fund annually as it had been some time previously, several years ago, when the amount authorized and appropriated was not fully used.

The reason I say that is as follows: In fiscal year 1965, \$150 million was authorized for the President's contingency fund; \$99.2 million was appropriated and, as a matter of fact, the obligations were only \$57 million. In 1966 there was \$50 million authorized and appropriated, which appears to have carried the contingency fund for 9 months. So I believe \$100 million extra added on for a 3-month period is at too great a rate for the President's contingency fund. I therefore recommend by my amendment that \$50 million now be added by the Congress to the President's contingency fund for the remaining 3 months after enactment until June 30, 1966. This will result by my amendment in a budget saving of \$50 million.

I do not favor Congress blindly authorizing and appropriating large sums of undesignated, unallocated, and unprogrammed funds.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of this committee, with his typically accurate and effective argument, has stated the basic reasons for this legislation. Most of the money in this bill is for the economic support of South Vietnam. This little country is war-torn and threatened with runaway inflation. She has committed thousands and tens of thousands of her sons to battle, and all reports that have come to my attention have indicated that her men are fighting with ever-in-

creasing effectiveness, and that they are giving magnificent accounts of themselves in the field.

But this bill is also a part of a wider effort about which our President spoke in his great address in New York City last night. He said:

The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—we are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

As this House acts on supplemental legislation for supporting our civilian and military men in Vietnam, I have no doubt that there will be vigorous debate. But let there be no mistake about our determination to resist Communist aggression in Vietnam. We have not sacrificed in Western Europe, in Berlin, in Greece and Turkey, in Korea, in the China Straits, in the missile crisis in Cuba, and now in Vietnam in vain. We are going to be true to our great principles of freedom, and to our commitments to help others preserve their independence.

I have heard it said that this is not a popular war, as if any war were popular. Some say the public does not understand why we are fighting—why we have such a vital interest in southeast Asia. And I say, as the President said last night—if you do not know, if you are not sure, ask the men who are there. They know.

Or ask the South Vietnamese, who have fought so valiantly to defend themselves. Ask the widows of the village chiefs who have been murdered by the Communists. Ask their sons and daughters. And they will tell you what Communist terror really means.

Or go through southeast Asia and ask leaders of Thailand, Malaya, the Philippines, Japan, why the war in Vietnam is important, and they will tell you.

Or, if you still do not believe, ask the Communists. They know what they are doing. They are not just fighting to win in Vietnam. They are fighting a so-called war of liberation which is a prelude to similar wars in every other underdeveloped country in the world. As the commanding general of North Vietnam said recently:

If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world.

Let us be clear on this point—we are not fighting against a Democratic revolution within South Vietnam. We are not even fighting just the Vietcong. We are fighting Communist aggression. It is a different form of aggression than we faced in Berlin or Korea, or Cuba, but for that reason it is even more dangerous. Earlier forms of Communist aggression were easier to combat. People's emotions are more readily aroused in a war of invasion than they are in a war of infiltration. The Communists know that, and they are counting on us not to have the will to fight.

By passing this legislation by an overwhelming vote the House will demonstrate once again to the entire world, and especially to the Communists, the

resolve of our country to stand firm against communism.

As the most powerful democratic nation on earth, we must bear the heavy responsibilities and burdens of leadership. The price of leadership is sacrifice—of men, of resources, of the normal pursuits of life. But these are small compared to the costs of failure. We have shouldered burdens before, and there is a long, hard road ahead.

But there is a human greatness in the democratic spirit, and in the soul of America, which will sustain us now as it has in the past. Without heroics, but with quiet courage and determination, Vietnamese and American men and women are proving once more the strength of free societies.

Sergeant Walling, U.S. Army, was such a man. You may remember what the President said about him:

On the 19th day of June, this year, a young and brave American set out into the jungles of a distant land—half a world away. He walked at the side of a patrol of young and brave Vietnamese.

Their purpose—and his—was to defend freedom against its aggressors.

The name of that American was Harry A. Walling.

He was a sergeant of the U.S. Army—and a proud member of the proud Special Forces who wear the green beret.

When the Vietnamese patrol came under attack, the only thought of Sergeant Walling was for the patrol—and its success. He gave no thought to safety or to self. Those who recovered his body found that, before he died, Sergeant Walling had fired his every round of ammunition.

We have come today to bestow upon Sergeant Walling one of our country's highest honors. No medal, no words, no eulogies of ours can honor him so highly as he has honored our country and our cause.

But we can—and we must always—honor ourselves by working everywhere we can, in every way we can, for a world of peace in which the young and the brave need not die in war.

When Sergeant Walling fell, he left behind his young widow and three young children—the oldest age 3, the youngest now 4 months. Mrs. Walling's bravery is no less than her husband's.

Two nights after she learned her husband would never return, Mrs. Walling wrote out a message to the other wives of her husband's unit. That remarkable letter has deeply touched all who have read it—including the Commander in Chief. I would like to read these lines from it:

"I know you are all afraid for your husbands and love them as much as I loved my husband. He loved me just as your husbands do you, and he didn't want to die. He had so much to live for. But he was a brave man and a fighting man. My husband died for what he believed in, and if he had a choice of where and how he would die, he would choose the same place—fighting for a decent world for his children to grow up in.

"So don't let the world, the loneliness, the despair, and the fear get you down. Stand as tall as that man of yours who wears the beret and thank God you got him * * * my prayers are that all of your husbands come home to you safe and well."

I am proud now on behalf of the Nation to bestow the Silver Star posthumously upon Sgt. Harry A. Walling.

Mr. Chairman, Sergeant Walling knew why he was in Vietnam. Now is the time for this House to show, once again, that it does too.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I gladly yield to the distinguished minority leader of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished majority leader's yielding to me at this point. I subscribe almost entirely to what the gentleman from Oklahoma has just said. I want to emphasize that we on our side of the aisle strongly favor a position of strength against Communist aggression in South Vietnam, southeast Asia, Berlin, or anywhere else throughout the world. We have in the past and will in the future.

I am proud of the fact that the House of Representatives is taking up this important legislation today, acting upon it, I believe, constructively, acting upon it promptly, with a minimum of controversy and, I trust, with a minimum of opposition.

It does deeply disturb me, however, that some Senators at the other end of the Capitol—I do not question their motives—are delaying the consideration of and the approval of legislation that is important to the execution of a policy of strength in southeast Asia. The enactment of this legislation will have an important impact, a favorable one, on the morale of our troops and our South Vietnam allies. Prompt action in the Congress will demonstrate to our enemies that the elected representatives of the American people can act affirmatively and constructively with the backing of a majority of the citizens in this great country.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman for what he has said. Certainly the House can demonstrate this afternoon, by the size of its vote and by the expeditious manner in which it acts, how it stands on this matter.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to direct constructive criticism toward this bill and the general problem which we face. I first wish to compliment the chairman of our committee for the very scholarly, the very distinguished, and the very statesmanlike manner in which he has conducted the operations on this side of the Congress. I would think the very least I could say about this bill as we process it this afternoon is that we are proceeding in a more practical way than our counterpart committee on the other side of the Congress and in a more practicable and reasonable fashion. I do commend the chairman, therefore, for his leadership and his soberness, even though I may not always agree with where he is leading us.

I should like to point out that there is really no argument for the passage of this bill. It is a \$415 million blank check for 4 months; that is, for the remaining 4 months of this fiscal year. If we had assurance that this money was intended entirely for South Vietnam in direct and practical support of our efforts there, I would have no criticism of it, but the fact of the matter is, as it was brought

out in the discussion earlier by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAMS], that there is not a single dollar of this that must reach Vietnam. It could be diverted to any place in the world.

For the Congress to hand the AID agency or the State Department a blank check for \$415 million is, in my opinion, an abdication of legislative responsibility. If we were to pin this money down without any doubt and were in effect to say to the American public the situation in Vietnam is so complicated and so dangerous in all its ramifications that we absolutely need \$415 million for that world trouble spot, then I would not object. But that is not what we are saying here this afternoon. I suppose it would be asking too much for the Members to have their attention directed to the supplemental views. However, if you will note, this report was written because we wanted to provide some constructive suggestions and voice some practical ideas on how this bill should be analyzed by the Members. I should like to reemphasize a number of points. For example, the question of AID borrowing millions of dollars from other sources supposedly to assist programs in Vietnam; the completely loose bookkeeping procedures followed in the various agencies with which we are working. None of these charges in the supplemental views have been answered because they cannot be answered. At the same time I am sure the Members are not really asking for an answer. From what I have gathered, the determination of the President—and I am commending him in it—has been greatly fortified by the return of the Vice President from a recent trip to eight capitals where he was received enthusiastically and some degree of at least verbal, if not actual, support was given to our efforts. I would certainly hope that any vote here this afternoon would be interpreted as support of the basic position of our country as outlined by the President and not the unfortunate and headline-hunting type of procedure followed by the other body. But I do not think it is at all practical or wise for the House of Representatives to have its action interpreted as handing the AID agency \$415 million to spend as they please. In the atmosphere of the crisis in Vietnam, we are giving this agency, which probably has the poorest overall record for efficiency and effectiveness, this huge sum without any practical conditions attached. I do not believe any sober reflection could sustain this. I do hope when we finally get to the bill for fiscal 1967, there we emphasize the fact that we ought to keep stringent congressional control of these funds. Secondly, we ought to study these funds in the light of their practical use and not the blind support which is demanded by the executive branch.

We could do a far more reasonable task of supporting the President if we would ask more constructive and necessary questions, not in the spirit of unnecessary criticism but in the spirit of helpful criticism, which he sorely needs.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, not to invoke an unharmonious note into this discussion, I do not want the Record to state, as indicated, that the majority view was less than sober, as the gentleman has said, and to reflect here and there upon the sobriety of the decision of the majority members of the committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct that impression. No agency in the history of our Government has been more closely scrutinized, down through the years, than has the AID agency. To say it has the poorest record in efficiency is not quite accurate. All of us look it over very carefully. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], looks at it very thoroughly, this House reviews it very thoroughly. I believe the record of efficiency of the AID agency is really one of the high-water marks of governmental efficiency, especially under the able direction of Mr. David Bell.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I say when I used the term "sober," it is to compare our actions with those of the committee of the other body. That is the context in which it is used.

However, Mr. Chairman, when we think of this \$415 million blank check and the fact that it is being requested to support a war effort in South Vietnam, it raises many other additional questions, I relate an incident which supposedly occurred in a parliament of a so-called friendly country.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that during debate in this parliamentary body, one of the parliamentarians rose with a resolution asking or demanding that its government declare war on the United States. When the shocked members wanted to know why, he explained it thusly: That their government was bankrupt, their people were grumbling at the lack of progress and comfort, and he felt that by declaring war on the United States and immediately losing the war, the country would then qualify for massive rehabilitation at U.S. expense.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that this resolution was going to pass in this parliamentary body and that they would have declared war on the United States, so as to reap the benefits which they hoped would follow. At that point a very astute member of that body rose and raised one question. This question was: What will we do if we win the war?

Mr. Chairman, what will it take to put South Vietnam back into its normal, quiet, sleepy, traditional basis? I do not believe it is at all realistic for the United States to be pumping these millions of dollars into dubious domestic programs in South Vietnam, when their economy, their traditions, and everything else involved in the history of that country, will show that they are not equipped to absorb it.

To sum it up, logical support of the President is an act of statesmanship. This blank check is irresponsibility.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER].

COMMODITY IMPORTS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has before it an urgent supplemental request from the Agency for International Development for \$275 million in order to carry on its program of supporting assistance in Vietnam.

The bulk of this appropriation will be used to finance imports of essential commodities.

During 1966 it will be critically important to step up the export of American steel, oil, medicine, building supplies, and machinery to support the general economy and avoid disastrous inflation in South Vietnam.

Inflationary pressures will mount in 1966 unless Vietnam can import roughly double its 1965 imports and unless other stabilization measures are taken. If not checked, runaway inflation in Vietnam could cancel many of our most important gains.

We must see to it that the shoe is not lost for want of a nail.

With a war-disrupted economy, South Vietnam has been unable to earn the foreign exchange needed to pay for these imports. Without them, the economy cannot function. Without enough of them, the already serious burden of inflation would become backbreaking.

Most of the commodity imports financed by AID move through regular commercial channels—meaning about 2,000 licensed importers in Vietnam. These merchants pay for aid-financed imports with their own currency, the piaster. The payment goes to the Vietnamese Government which uses the money to finance the war effort. AID requires that these imports be American made and that the American supplier be paid in dollars by AID when he ships his merchandise to Vietnam. Thus, AID is not providing dollars to Vietnam that can feed a black market in currency.

There is a black market in Vietnam, but it is not being fed by our aid. U.S. personnel in Vietnam, both civilian and military, are paid in script to avoid currency inflation. But in any country where foreign exchange is rationed for essential purposes, there are those who seek to obtain hard currencies for their personal use and are willing to pay high prices for dollars or pounds or francs. American officials and the South Vietnamese Government are attacking these problems at their source, and the improvement of the Vietnamese administrative ability and strengthening of controls will tend to dry up black market operations.

But the surest way to eliminate such operations is to bring supply more nearly in balance with demand—and this is what the commodity import program is designed to do. It may seem a small part, but let me assure you it is an extremely important part—of the total effort to help repel Communist aggression and to help the Government of Vietnam develop a society resistant to subversion and capable of independent progress.

AID's commodity import program for Vietnam may be as important to our ultimate success as any of our military weaponry. I fully support the supple-

mental request to carry this program forward.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. In light of the statement that the gentleman has made about the commodity import program strengthening the Cao Ky government, I wonder if the gentleman would comment on the testimony of Mr. Bell, the AID administrator, which is found on page 8 of the hearings where Mr. Bell stated:

But I would not argue in the slightest there is not some diversion both in the sense of people putting money outside the country in Hong Kong and Switzerland, and in the sense of significant amounts of resources being obtained by the Vietcong from Saigon and the import system.

I assume he was referring to the fact that we are not dealing here in the commodity import program with the South Vietnamese Government but rather with private importers who may in many cases misuse the privilege they have of exchanging piasters for military pay certificates at very profitable rates.

Mr. GRIDER. I will say to the gentleman, this of course is a possibility. I mentioned in my remarks that this condition was being improved. I would not suggest, and I do not think the gentleman would suggest that the whole import program be turned over to the Government. We are trying to stimulate private enterprise in South Vietnam.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. The gentleman indicated in his statement that the recipient of this aid is the Government of South Vietnam. It is my understanding that the direct recipient, and properly so if we are going to recognize the value of the profit motive, is the private business sector in South Vietnam. That sector, of course, pays taxes on many of these commodities—rice is not one of them—but on many of these items included in the commodity import program. Is that not a correct statement of how the commodity import program works?

Mr. GRIDER. That is not to say that we should abandon the program because some of the people importing have been guilty of misfeasance; no.

Mr. MacGREGOR. And that the gentleman from Minnesota did not say or suggest.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169, the supplemental foreign assistance authorization for fiscal year 1966.

Having just returned from an official but brief trip to South Vietnam for the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, I believe it is important to report briefly on a few of the matters before the House today.

It is correct that this overall authorization of \$415 million is essential to the success of our joint efforts in South Vietnam—for financing the import of essential commodities, for rural construction,

for port expansion, for refugee relief, and for general development.

The conflict in Vietnam cannot be won by military means alone because the military operations there are important largely as they allow the country to proceed with its social and economic reconstruction programs. Given the defeat of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese main force units, the civil actions programs in the villages and hamlets may have the security with which to proceed.

I would like to stress to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, the seriousness and the magnitude of the problem—and the major job that has to be done.

First, a word about the general logistic situation and the port of Saigon. We are some 3 to 4 months behind in catching up with our supply effort and our logistic needs. This has not been clearly stated, and I think it should be. The administration did not anticipate—even though this may have been difficult to foresee—the magnitude of the supply buildup. They did not get on top of it fast enough nor establish clear priorities.

Moreover, the Government in Saigon has been very slow to organize and direct the actual port operations. For many years there have been six or more different agencies involved—a system that is inefficient if not worse. At last I think we have had some serious discussions with the Government in Saigon on the need for single port management, and we are now starting to take corrective and vigorous measures to catch up. The new port at Cam Ranh Bay is encouraging, and new port and airfield facilities now under construction will markedly help. However, it is still a major problem.

Second, the question of inflation is real. During the past year the price of rice to the consumer in Saigon has gone up about 40 percent. Hopefully Prime Minister Ky, with a budget of 55 billion piasters, will try to keep expenses in line.

It is something of a commentary on the conflict in South Vietnam, and also an element in this import financing program, to note that a few years ago South Vietnam exported about 300,000 tons of rice. It was a significant part of the rice bowl in southeast Asia.

Today, because of Vietcong terrorism and the actions of main force units, Saigon has to import about 400,000 tons of rice. This is a measure of the problem.

The real job ahead, however, lies in the rural areas; in the villages and hamlets of South Vietnam representing about 80 percent of the people. We should recognize in this House that this is very nearly a lost revolution. For almost 20 years or more, very little has been done by the Government in Saigon to meet the revolution of rising expectations, to reach and work with the people in the villages, to offer them genuine participation in their Government and their future.

Hopefully, and at last, a program has been started that will give the people of South Vietnam some hope that the Government cares about their concerns, is going to work with them, and is going to meet the problem. During my recent trip I visited a village where the civil action program is in operation and a camp where political action workers are being trained. In the camp there are

3,000 students enrolled. The women are being trained in first aid, teaching, and health education; and the men are being taught construction and trade skills, the elements of rebuilding hamlet government, and necessary paramilitary skills.

Once trained, the students are divided into teams of approximately 40 members and sent back into the province from where they were recruited by the South Vietnamese province chief. They will work, live, and sleep in their villages. All too often in the past because of the Vietcong terror, village and hamlet chiefs left their village in time of peril to seek sanctuary in the district of provincial capital. Needless to say, this did not always enhance respect for them in their own villages. By the end of 1966 it is expected that civil action teams will be in 1,000 of the country's 12,000 villages and hamlets in four areas.

But I do not think we should kid ourselves about the nature, the character, or the extent of this commitment. We are dealing with a situation that is political and military—unless there is real security in the villages and hamlets, the pacification program will not really get off the ground. Over 20,000 village and hamlet chiefs have been assassinated in the last 3 years—one of the most recent was the tragic assassination of the popular mayor of Ap Quang Nam, a quiet, peaceful village which appeared to be on the road to pacification.

Equally the civil action program and rural reconstruction are long range and will take at least 5 years—possibly 10 or more.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I would state that unless the central government in Saigon initiates genuine and far-reaching reforms in education, in land reform, in opening opportunities to the refugees, and in creating a sense and a conviction as to opportunity and participation for all people in South Vietnam, the work in the villages will not be supported and hope will be dashed.

We and our allies are committed in South Vietnam. We must fully back our men in the field—whose morale is magnificent—and we must do all we can to encourage South Vietnamese efforts at reform and reconstruction. Hence the need for this authorization which I support today.

And at all times we must utilize every resource of diplomacy—including the United Nations—to reach the conference table and an honorable peace.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if I have been surprised by anything in this discussion today, I must confess that what surprises me most is the unanimity of opinion that seems to be apparent. If I had a hat, I think I would take it off in salute to those gentlemen who have joined in a bipartisan foreign policy effort which is so vital to the security of the United States and to the free world. I would trust that we would have more of this kind of support of our effort on the part of both sides of the aisle.

I am a strong one for dissent, and I am a firm believer in discussion. I

think the discussion here today, however, has made it extremely clear—at least to me—that everyone recognizes full well the depth of the crisis. We might have doubts; we might have reservations; we might have wishes; we might have our "druthers"; but it looks like what we are going to do is to support this authorization as a matter of correct policy for the United States of America just as we supported the resolution giving the President the full authority in 1964 to use armed force in Vietnam. And we ought to support this authorization because it is the right thing to do.

I do not know what is going to happen in the other body or what kind of debate will take place in the other body from this time forward. But for me here today I am perfectly satisfied with the discussion and the debate which has transpired in behalf of the American people.

We have been holding hearings in the Foreign Affairs Committee almost daily since we reconvened this year. We have had full debate and discussion either in the full committee on the authorization or in one subcommittee or another on this entire subject of southeast Asia, including Vietnam. Everyone has had ample opportunity to get their viewpoint across, to be heard, to criticize, to delve, to contradict, to distract, or to do anything they want to do.

All members certainly have ample opportunity here on the floor, to say anything they wanted to about the policy of this country. But we are at the crux of United States-Vietnam policy today with the vote on this particular authorization. With the transpiring of the events since we last convened here in this body, we know a major change has taken place not only in Vietnam and around the world but also in the thinking of the American people. That is why this vote is important.

When we vote today we give a resounding vote of support to the President, and we are giving a resounding vote of support to the policy of this country.

I shall support this authorization and the necessary appropriation and the subsequent defense supplemental authorization and appropriation, because, as far as I am concerned, the military effort and the economic effort in Vietnam are inseparable in the policy of the United States in dealing with the problem of Vietnam, southeast Asia, the free world, and the security of the United States.

I am delighted at the courageous statement on the part of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAMS], who says he will support, if I understood him correctly, this authorization for those very same reasons.

We all have recognized the tremendous cost of doing a job that needs to be done and that has never been done before in the history of the world, in waging the kind of fight we are fighting in Vietnam and at the same time trying to help in maintaining a government and reconstruct the country while the warfare is going on. This only points out what we should have recognized and do now recognize, that we—the United States and the free world—must have a

nonmilitary answer to the subversive thrusts of communism anywhere in the world.

I disagree with those who say that we ought to always support the status quo, or that we should let people stew in their own juice, or that we should let the rest of the people of the world wallow in the depths of their own misery. This indicates to me a kind of blindspot, that we in the United States can live in some way apart from the rest of the world, and that we can bulldoze our allies into doing what we want to do when we want to do it, as if they have no sovereign rights, no right to independent thought, no right to independent action.

Certainly I get aggravated because other countries do not agree with me and my country at a time when I think they ought to. But is this not the very strength of our free and democratic system? The United States makes no claim of having a totalitarian hold on the rest of the free world. We act in concert but do so voluntarily. Is not this the kind of freedom we fight for? We are trying now to help the people of South Vietnam, who have fought for 100 years to throw off the yoke of oppression. Is this not what we are trying to do? Of course it is. We know it—the whole world knows it.

Most of the American people care, support this principle, and the price not only to assure the security of the United States, but also to assure that freedom as such—the concepts that we hold so dear and that we have fought for and that we are fighting for right now—have a chance to live. Because without that, then the money does not have any meaning.

So I want to join all of you today on the floor of this House who say: "We trust our President, our military and political leaders who support this request pending here." I believe that we have to do what is necessary, in what is a war zone, not only in the military sense but in the political sense.

Mr. Chairman, I have one concluding thought, I trust this authorization will be overwhelmingly approved. It should be.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, my participation in this debate, completely unexpected, was prompted by the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], who made a disclosure on the floor of this House which, to say the least, surprised if not amazed me, when he recited the participation of other nations to the war in Vietnam.

Now let it be known, I have supported the administration completely in its views on Vietnam because I believe if Vietnam falls, so does all of Asia fall. I also believe that our Nation should keep its word. We were a signator to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. I quote from that treaty. Article IV reads:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any State or territory which the parties by

unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger, etc.

This document is one of the legal and moral bases for our involvement. We are keeping our pledge. But what about the other signatories to the treaty? What about the other nations in Asia who are so vitally affected?

I would like to propound three questions either to the Chairman or to any member of the Committee. In view of the reasons advanced as to why we are in Vietnam I would like to know, first, what are the Asian countries doing to protect Asia? It seems to me that if there were a flood in Pennsylvania and I were asked to come over and help the people of Pennsylvania to still the floodwaters, I would expect every Pennsylvanian to be there helping me. Our people want to know why Asia is not helping Asia.

The second question is this: What are the other signatories to this treaty doing to help implement the treaty and to carry out their word of honor that they would participate and oppose aggression?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Third, and I guess the most important question, because I think the first two questions are already answered by the disclosures of the gentleman from Iowa—the most important question is this, in my judgment, and I believe it is in the judgment of the American people: What is the administration doing to—and for want of a better word I say—to persuade the Asian countries and the signatories under this treaty to make a comparable—if not an equal at least a comparable—contribution to the one which we are making by giving each day that goes by our men in order to save southeast Asia for the Asian countries and for the world and to carry out our pledge?

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] for an answer to those questions.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that there is a considerable effort being made on the part of our allies to bring stability and peace to southeast Asia. While one of the gentlemen on the other side has derided the efforts of some of these nations, nevertheless Australia is making a substantial contribution. Australia has sustained casualties and men have been killed. South Korea is making a substantial contribution. They have 20,000 troops there and there is an additional troop contingent earmarked for Vietnam. The British, as signatories to the treaty, have 50,000 troops in Malaysia fighting the same kind of problem which we have. We have significant forces in Japan. The Philippines are our great friend and ally. They are sending troops.

I am sure history will record that Thailand is making one of the great and valiant contributions to the activities in Vietnam. New Zealand has troops there. India and Pakistan, of course, we recognize have problems of their own,

but by and large there is a great contribution being made by our allies there.

I think our Secretary of State and our Vice President, on the recent trip he made, have had some encouraging reports on the contribution which is going to be made on the part of our allies. I think we should start to focus on what is being done instead of what is not being done.

Mr. CAHILL. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to finish the last minute by making this observation. I have particular reference to the signatories to the treaty. The United Kingdom, New Zealand, France, Australia, Pakistan, and, of course, what the gentleman from Iowa put into the RECORD which is represented by him at least to have come from the State Department delineating what their contributions are. My only point is this, Mr. GALLAGHER. I, of course, as I say, have supported the administration but I think there ought to be a greater effort made on the part of the administration to bring to the attention of these countries in southeast Asia the great danger which is facing them. They should be urged, if not persuaded, to make a contribution of military forces. I think the signatories to this treaty also ought to be urged to do likewise, because until they do that our people at home do not realize and do not appreciate that they are making what should be one of the real contributions to this overall effort.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, today, as we all know, some 200,000 American men are engaged in a war on the mainland of Asia, some 10,000 miles from our shores. Last night the President of the United States said he could not predict how long we would bear this burden. There is mounting evidence that the more men we involve in the jungles of Vietnam, the more men North Vietnam and the Vietcong are committing.

The escalation continues.

Mr. Chairman, it is reliably reported that the United States may have to double its manpower in Vietnam to 400,000 men, or even 600,000 men, in order to stabilize the situation and to bring under control any significant part of the territory of South Vietnam.

The callup of Reserves appears to be imminent.

Mr. Chairman, on past occasions on the floor of this House I have expressed my reservations and my misgivings about our policy in southeast Asia. I have proposed alternatives. On June 10, 1964, during debate on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, I urged a negotiated settlement and spelled out specific proposals. I pointed out then that any solution must be accompanied by genuine economic and political reform. Now we are engaged in a land war in Asia, a war that prominent U.S. military experts have advised us against. Since May 5 of last year when I opposed the \$700 million supplemental appropriation for military activities in Vietnam, a war in which we were supposedly performing an advisory capacity under the military

assistance program, has been converted to an American war which we are in fact waging on a much larger scale.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it has been a fundamental error to rely, as we have, upon a military solution and to have underestimated the economic aspects, the social aspects, and the political aspects of this struggle.

We are today considering a bill which is concerned with the economic aspects, concerned with the social aspects, and concerned with the political aspects of this struggle. It provides \$175 million for the commercial import assistance program, which in effect is a program to support the war-torn economy. It provides \$100 million for what is called rural construction.

In the past our AID programs have not put sufficient emphasis on this rural construction effort. They have not given enough attention to the need to reach the people out in the countryside.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill. I do so even though much of the money and effort will be drained off by the growing conflict.

I hope we will be able to see some daylight in reaching into the hearts and the minds of the people in South Vietnam.

This is a struggle which, if it is going to be won, is going to have to be won politically; it is going to have to be won diplomatically, and in terms which the people themselves will be able to understand.

However, as long as the war escalates, our economic assistance program tends to become an extension of the military program since it is used to meet the effects of the war, not to develop a future peacetime economy.

U.S. military expenses in Vietnam are running at about \$10 billion a year, while economic aid for Vietnam is costing about half a billion dollars a year.

In yesterday's New York Times, Seymour Topping, respected southeast Asia correspondent, writes:

The South Vietnamese population is, according to all accounts, suffering more from military operations, terrorism, economic dislocation and corruption than at any other time during more than two decades of intermittent war.

He goes on to say that the social fabric of the country "seems to be unraveling."

We should recognize that the \$275 million increase in AID funds are unlikely to bring about significant changes in the dreary and frustrating picture described by the New York Times correspondent as long as the war continues to expand.

The American people should not be misled into thinking that our AID dollars will build a Great Society in South Vietnam. The fact is that, of necessity, more, and more AID money is going into the support of the war economy and not on economic development that will have long-range benefits for the Vietnamese people.

Eighty percent of the population lives in rural villages, but AID, because of the war, can take only token steps to improve the lot of the peasants.

In appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 26, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said:

The free Vietnam we seek to preserve through military efforts and sacrifices must not be undermined by economic and social chaos and despair. The expanding scale of Communist aggression and military response have added new dimensions to the task of AID.

He added that he regarded economic assistance programs in Vietnam as of equal importance with military assistance efforts.

An increasingly larger share of AID funds will have to be directed to the task of keeping the Vietnam economy from collapsing under the inflationary pressures produced by the war. Rural construction programs in the villages and rural areas to develop school systems, water supplies, health stations, and agricultural know-how will be affected by the need to use funds to check the runaway inflation and by the realities of the military situation. Vietcong terror and destruction will prevent their implementation in 75 percent of the country.

David E. Bell, Administrator of AID, in appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, stated that our supporting assistance obligations had reached \$235 million by the end of 1965. This is almost the entire amount—\$255 million—appropriated for fiscal 1966.

To cope with rampant inflation, AID has expanded the financing of commercial imports. Of the additional \$275 million that is sought, a total of \$175 million will be allocated to this import program. And Mr. Bell states that he expects these inflationary pressures to be far more severe in 1966.

Assuming the supplemental funds authorized by the bill before us are appropriated, it is estimated that some \$370 million of the total \$530 million AID funds for Vietnam for fiscal year 1966 will be used for this import program. For fiscal 1967 this figure is expected to increase to \$420 million.

This program finances the import of both consumer goods and industrial materials to keep manufacturing and construction going, and to absorb the increased purchasing power. The disruption of the economy by the war necessitates this expanded assistance.

In addition to the \$175 million to finance an expanded import program, a total of \$100 million is asked for an expansion of counterinsurgency efforts or for "logistics, construction, welfare, and development projects." Here again, it is clear that these efforts for the most part are related to the military situation in the country and are war-support measures, involving construction projects to ease critical problems caused by damaged bridges, highways, clogged ports and warehouses. Also some \$20 million is needed to operate the growing refugee program, again a war-related project.

Only about \$50 million of the total \$530 million available is intended for the rural pacification or rural construction programs that attempt to satisfy

some of the basic needs of the 13 million Vietnamese peasants.

It has been reliably estimated that at least \$390 million of the total \$530 million will be spent on programs and projects that can be attributed to the deterioration of the Vietnam economy because of the war. Therefore, only some \$140 million is to be used for economic development programs, either of the rural variety or of the type involving the construction of highways or the training of teachers.

While I support this supplementary authorization, we should not be deluded into believing that these funds will somehow open up a new era in the economic development of Vietnam and that this will turn the military tide.

Can war be waged and meaningful, grassroot economic development of a peasant economy be carried out concurrently? More than \$2.7 billion has been poured into economic assistance programs in Vietnam in the last decade. Because it has mainly been used to support the savage war, there are precious few results to show for our munificence.

Let us not expect any dramatic results from the \$275 million that we are asked to approve for Vietnam today. Let us be frank with ourselves and with our fellow Americans.

The war in Vietnam has claimed many victims, including Great Society programs at home. The long-range purpose of the AID program is one of the casualties. I fear that this will continue to be the case until there is peace in that war-torn country or at the very least until there is a cessation of hostilities.

The goals outlined by the President at the Honolulu conference are both admirable and praiseworthy. Plans were articulated for more intensive efforts to pacify the countryside by economic and political means so that a government apparatus can be set up that might be responsive to the needs of the vast majority of the population.

President Johnson has said:

The war we are helping them fight must be won on two fronts. One is military. The other front is the struggle against social injustice; against hunger, disease, and ignorance; against political apathy and indifference.

Of course, we ought to direct our energies and efforts to the second front that the President talks about.

However, it is going to be almost impossible to succeed against political apathy and indifference while the Vietnamese peasant is trapped and buffeted by this war. One day the Vietcong attack his village and destroy his home; the next day American bombers wreak havoc in his hamlet, in quest of the Vietcong.

The limited rural pacification program that AID is undertaking may be about all that can be done in the incredibly difficult circumstances of a full-scale land war. If the Vietnamese peasant is to be persuaded, if imaginative programs concerned with the welfare of the Vietnamese people are to be set up in the provinces, then first a way to end the fighting will have to be found. Only

then can meaningful economic development of the country be carried out.

If the Saigon Government hopes to be successful when free elections are finally held, it must forge firm political, economic, and social links with the people.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is now encouraging the central government to adopt a program which will build hospitals, and health stations and schools, and help with the development of the agricultural economy. This, the President talked about at Honolulu as the second front in this war. But let us face the fact that we are really not going to be able to succeed with this second front so long as it is operated concurrently with an enlarged and escalated military effort.

The second front to gain the support of the people, the war to conquer disease and hunger in South Vietnam, is hamstrung by this total involvement in military operations. As long as the South Vietnamese peasant is caught between the Vietcong on the one hand and the U.S. military forces on the other, he simply is not going to have an opportunity to develop the relationship which is needed with his own government.

So, Mr. Chairman, while it is necessary to expand and extend our economic assistance, nevertheless, we should not believe that this will open up any Great Society for the people of South Vietnam. This is doing nothing more than enabling them to keep their heads above water economically. It should be recognized and supported for what it is.

It is imperative that we spare no effort and leave no stone unturned to reach a peaceful solution of this tragic conflict.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for yielding me the additional time.

In summary, I believe the objectives of this proposal, particularly of the rural construction program, are meaningful objectives, and I hope that from this point on a great deal more effort will be put into political and social programs which should, if properly carried out, reach the people. This is a struggle for the hearts and minds of men. In the long run it will be won by the power of our ideals.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the discussion today has indicated quite clearly why we can be confident that there will be virtual unanimity in favor of this bill. I surely hope that will be the case because in my opinion, this is a most important bill. It is important also that we move with reasonable speed.

There has been some indication during the debate today about whether or not we are wise in mounting the military effort that we have been making in Vietnam. However, there can be little debate on the advisability of the funds which are being sought in this bill. These funds are not being requested to

prosecute a war, although they are, as President Johnson indicated, of equal basic importance to our military effort there. Unquestionably, the aid which will be provided in this bill will be used to help provide a strong front against aggression. As Vice President HUMPHREY said at a briefing at the White House today, we are concerned both with a war against aggression and a war on misery.

Quite briefly, these funds are to help us in the latter struggle.

I should like very briefly to report what the Secretary of State said before the Committee on Foreign Affairs when he justified the funds. I quote:

The free Vietnam we seek to preserve through military efforts and sacrifices must not be undermined by economic and social chaos and despair. The expanding scale of Communist aggression and our military response have added new dimensions to the task of AID. Without our AID programs we could win the major military battles in Vietnam and still lose the war and the peace.

For this reason I regard our economic assistance programs in Vietnam as equal in importance, although not nearly so large in scale, with our military assistance.

I should also like to give the two major reasons why the Secretary of State appealed for these funds.

He says the first reason is to meet, and I quote:

First, to meet the rising and severe threat of inflationary pressures, additional funds are needed to finance imported goods; \$175 million are now needed to finance importation for commercial sale of goods such as rice, construction materials, petroleum products, fertilizer, drugs, and many other commodities. In this way we contribute to economic and political stability, by offsetting shortages in local production and maintaining morale essential to the entire effort.

Second, \$100 million is needed to fund new or expanded activities to strengthen the Government of Vietnam's work in contested rural areas. These AID operations include refugee relief—

And we have heard of the many hundreds of thousands of refugees who are presently in South Vietnam—

provision of medical teams and individual doctors and nurses; building or repairing of hospitals and veterans' rehabilitation centers; leasing of ships for coastal and ocean supply operations; expanding civil airlift capacity; building of warehouses, bridges, roads; repair of war-damaged rail and other facilities; installation of temporary and permanent electric power services; construction of workers' housing and training centers; police equipment and training—

Quite obviously, the list is long. The needs of South Vietnam are tremendous. It is quite evident that if we do authorize the money, it will be spent in that country and, of course, in the countries around Vietnam in the amounts which have been requested.

I myself believe that an argument can be made to support earmarking funds in a foreign aid bill. In this case, however, it is unrealistic for us to argue that there is any need to earmark these particular funds. It is quite obvious that the basic necessity is there. The necessity is obvious from the fact that we have already borrowed almost \$64 million from other funds within the foreign aid program. From the amount being requested, that

sum must be reimbursed. So the basic issue should be, not how much might be diverted to areas not of primary concern such as Vietnam, but how much more will be needed in that country.

Whether or not language is put in the bill to require earmarking, it is quite clear the administration will do as it has indicated. We have every reason to trust them.

One final point, Mr. Chairman. There has been some indication of dissatisfaction with the contributions of our allies to the effort we are making in Vietnam. Of course, our effort is tremendous. Of course, every effort should be made to have that burden shared with our friends and allies and others who have an interest in southeast Asia. Yet we do ourselves no good and we surely are not recognizing the contributions that our allies have made, or that they might make, by in effect belittling and sneering at what they have done.

In many cases these countries are poor and primarily concerned with their own problems. In many cases there has been a substantial contribution already made, and more are evidently in the works. Without any question the neighbors of Vietnam realize the importance of what is going on there. There is an increasing awareness of the practical problem that we have faced up to so deliberately.

Quite practically, one of the reasons why some of our small allies or our less wealthy allies have not done more may be because they are somewhat intimidated by the nature and the size of the effort of the United States. When we can afford to pour the billions of dollars that we do into this effort of ours—and it is primarily our effort—it does make any minor contribution from a small country seem like very little. Yet the sacrifices involved in order to make those small contributions should, I believe, not only be recognized but should be received with thankfulness.

In conclusion I should simply like to reiterate that the funds we are requesting here today are a relatively small part of the fight and the effort which we are making in southeast Asia. But these funds are of equal importance and significance to our military efforts in the success of our efforts. I hope we are virtually unanimous in supporting the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I had the good fortune of going on a study mission to the Orient during the last congressional recess.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169. I do so because I have seen what our dedicated AID people have done and are continuing to do in our friendly Asian countries. They have performed and are continuing to perform near miracles in helping our Asian friends to help themselves.

In Taiwan, for example, our AID people have helped to create such a viable agricultural economy that the farmer and the farmworker enjoy a higher income than the factory worker.

In Korea, our AID program under Public Law 480 has been so successful that we have virtually wiped out hunger and so-called spring scarcity in Suwon Valley and other once poverty stricken areas. I was never so proud of being an American as I was last November, as I stood atop a knoll overlooking the rice fields of Suwon Valley, and the Governor of Kyonggi Province pinned a medal on my chest as he conferred an honorary citizenship on me. I knew then that I was being so honored, not because I looked like one of them, or because I spoke their language, but because I was an American and represented that country which had helped them to live the better life that they are now enjoying.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Korea are truly grateful for what we have done to help them through our AID programs.

And so are the people of Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and South Vietnam. But there is much more that needs to be done and must be done, if we are to win the peace, especially in South Vietnam.

In South Vietnam the farmer cultivates a land capable of great productivity. Despite a primitive system of agriculture, inadequate tools, and lack of technical knowledge, South Vietnam used to be the rice bowl of southeast Asia. The Vietcong with their acts of terrorism have changed it from a land of abundance to a land of hunger.

Plagued by mass murders, fire, and destruction, South Vietnam has become an importer instead of an exporter of rice.

With the assistance of American AID programs the people of South Vietnam are striving to make the land productive once more in the midst of war. AID seeks to give the Vietnamese farmer a stake in his country and a chance to live in peace and security. More than 1,000 agricultural extension agents have been trained with U.S. help since 1955. More than 800 of these are working in the rural areas of the country. Three new vocational agriculture schools have more than 1,500 students enrolled. And an increasing number of skilled specialists have been graduated from agricultural colleges since 1962. Experimental stations in agriculture have been established with U.S. help in a nationwide network.

A national seed board has been organized to plan and expedite the multiplication of superior seed varieties, tested and produced by the experimental stations. Improved rice seed has been distributed to more than 50,000 families. Where fertilizer has been distributed, crop yields have increased by as much as 40 percent; and these programs are continuing. Pesticides, too, are helping the farmer increase his yields—he can take advantage of these benefits through liberal credit programs—and he does.

He has been able to get breeder pigs, corn to fatten them, and concrete to build sties. An AID-sponsored veterinary program has eliminated hog cholera—a serious killer disease, and the farmer now has new income from the sale of his pigs, and he can continue moving toward a better life.

Until peace comes to the land, however, its fullest productivity cannot be

realized. And so, we give to our allies in South Vietnam the benefits of crops grown in our own land. Through the food-for-peace program, in what must be the most graphic illustration of what the program can mean, we are making a number of our products—such as sweetened condensed milk, wheat flour, rice, and vegetable oil—available to supplement the produce of South Vietnam.

Progress has been made in the fishing industry, too. At least 14 major fish markets and wharves have been built and put into operation. More than 10,000 boats have been equipped with motors, and all time highs are being reached in the catches. Thus fishing is becoming a major source of income and the increase means that food is available at lower cost to the Vietnamese consumer.

Mr. Chairman, through AID programs we have been able to show the South Vietnamese that he now has a stake in the outcome of the war. By helping himself and learning new and better methods, the Vietnamese farmer realizes now that he is building for a better future for himself and his loved ones.

If we are to win the war in Vietnam we must continue to expand our efforts to improve Vietnamese agriculture and provide a solid basis of security for the Vietnamese people. If we are to win the peace we must increase our efforts to export our know-how and show-how to those in need. This our dedicated AID people have done most commendably, and through the support of Congress must continue to do.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] for his excellent statement. It is a pleasure to report to the House on the great service that he rendered our country on his tour of the Far East during the congressional recess. He was certainly a one-man ambassador of good will for the United States and the American people in all the friendly Asian countries we on the committee visited.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I have been deeply interested through all of this debate, interested particularly in the unanimity that seems to pervade this Chamber. We do not agree on all of this bill, and a good many of us would like to see the contingency fund changed. We will see what happens when the amendments are suggested.

The war there is something that we are quite unable to understand unless we have been fortunate enough to have gone over there, as I was fortunate enough to go to Europe during the war, and to have seen the way things really happen.

You have seen what it does to our men. I hope you saw what I have had told to me so many times—the tremendous courage of our soldiers and their certainty that they are fighting the fight for

right, for freedom, for everything that matters in living, and that they propose to win.

I hope this bill will make possible in our explanation of it to our people at home, and of the use that is made of the money—that we will be able to demonstrate more and more each day that we are there because we were invited; that we are still there because we cannot betray those people over there and leave them to the Communists.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Chairman, that this bill may be passed practically, if not entirely, unanimously.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to share in this rising tide of unanimity and to announce my support of this legislation that we are considering here today.

I, too, want to compliment those Members on the other side of the aisle who have recognized that support of our country and support of the President in these difficult days does require that we join together at times like this with the objective of backing up our men in uniform and our civilian administrators who are in the field in southeast Asia and at the same time helping to strengthen the social fabric of our friends in South Vietnam.

It is particularly important in considering this legislation to see just what it does in its significant sections.

Mention has already been made of the \$175 million that would go for the financing of additional imports, but it is in the \$100 million section, I think, that most of the impact resides. This section affects people. It involves refugee relief. It involves activities to improve conditions in rural areas. It involves the provision of doctors and nurses and medical teams. It involves the construction or the repair of bridges, roads, and rail facilities. It involves the construction of hospitals and workers' housing. Finally, it involves training of police and security forces who will help to bring to the countryside and to the people protection from the depredations of the Vietcong which have terrorized them for so long.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] said that we are not going to build a great society with this program. That is true, but I am sure that no one connected with this bill at any stage had any idea that we would do such a thing. First of all this is an emergency program and is limited in scope. Second, the element that has been preventing us from moving into the field of assistance where we could consider cooperation on a peacetime program has not been any activity of ours but the aggression of North Vietnam and the terroristic activities of the Vietcong. Certainly we could cooperate in a peacetime constructive program if these destructive activities were curtailed or eliminated.

This then is foreign aid, but it is foreign aid that is specialized and limited. I certainly have no doubt, even though doubt has been expressed here today by some people, as to what will be the des-

tinuation of the funds that are authorized in this legislation. There is no question in my mind that not only these funds but several times the amount of the funds provided in this authorization could be and will be probably used in a relatively brief time in South Vietnam.

Of course, we are dealing through this bill and through the defense appropriation bill which will come to us very shortly with the aggressive Communist imperialism. Certainly we want to do everything we can to repel this imperialism.

Incidentally, in considering the activities and contributions of some of our allies and associates I should like to add to what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], said about some of them; namely that there are two other countries who have very substantial problems of their own and are still dealing with them. One of these is Malaysia where the British have contributed 50,000 troops, and the other is Indonesia which is going through revolutionary throes now because of the Communist aggression in that country.

So I think this legislation does say that this program is important. It does say that it is needed now. It does say that it is so important that it cannot wait for regular legislation to be taken up in the normal process of things. It is serving a vital program of our Nation. It is backing up the 500,000 men of the Republic of South Vietnam who are in the field and are saying by their presence there that they are worthy of our support. I am sure that the House will do no less than give its overwhelming and I hope unanimous backing to this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman I, too, want to say that I am pleased at the unanimity that is shown here this afternoon on this particular piece of legislation. There may be disagreements on some elements of it. I think the House is aware of the fact that I have been as much of a critic and watchdog of the AID administration as most anybody in the House. I asked the Secretary of State when he was testifying before our committee on this bill about the black marketing in Saigon. I pointed out that when the staff director of our committee and I were there we had been apprised of one person who sent a substantial sum of money back to the United States. The Secretary assured us that day he would have the matter looked into very closely. I have learned only today that one civilian employee of a contractor out there has been ordered out of the country and has had his passport invalidated because he sent back \$30,000 to the United States and could not explain how he got it.

This sort of thing is, unfortunately, almost inevitable in a situation like this, but I am delighted to be able to say that the people responsible for the AID program and for our conduct out there are alert and that when these matters are brought to their attention they do something about them. I believe that is a helpful thing, as far as I am personally

concerned, and should be as far as the House of Representatives is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter that I would like to mention. I would like to sort of apologize to the House of Representatives. There have been a lot of remarks made on the other side of this building which I believe have aided our enemies out there, because I believe they are hoping for us to get tired of this war and quit. I further believe that is the reason they think they are winning.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the junior Senator from my State made a personal attack upon the Secretary of State and said that he ought to resign. On behalf of the people of my district I want to apologize, because I supported the junior Senator a year ago last fall. He ran 1,025,000 votes behind the President in Ohio, the junior Senator's majority in the entire State of Ohio was 16,000 votes. He received a larger majority than that in my district.

So, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my constituents I want to apologize for his intemperate attack upon the Secretary of State, whom I think is doing a great job under very difficult circumstances.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I am delighted to yield to my fine colleague from Ohio, the Congressman at Large, and who represents all of the State of Ohio.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] for the courageous position he has taken here today in offering an apology to the House of Representatives and to the Nation for the quite intemperate remarks of the junior Senator from the State of Ohio made in the other body here yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of the State of Ohio, I would like to join with the gentleman from Ohio. I feel we can be doves and hawks and of various opinions without resorting to such disagreeable tones.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from the State of Florida [Mr. FASCELL] said earlier this afternoon, these are times when great unanimity must be displayed by those of us on the side of freedom.

I feel that the intemperate personal attack upon the most distinguished foreign minister this Republic has had in many years is certainly out of order, and I certainly offer an extreme apology on the part of the people of the Buckeye State.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the distinguished and hard-working gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I support this legislation, and I support the President's position. As I told a member of the administration today, the gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol who are attacking us, who are attacking our being in South Vietnam, have nothing to lose politically, because if we win this thing they have 4 or 5 years to go before they are up for election, and everyone will forget their position.

Mr. Chairman, if, God forbid, we should lose it, they can say "I told you so."

So, Mr. Chairman, they have nothing to lose politically; they cannot lose.

In conclusion, I would like to allude to one remark that our junior Senator made. He said he would sleep better at night if somebody else were Secretary of State. Well, if he sleeps at the switch much more than he does now, he will be asleep 24 hours a day.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement on H.R. 12169, a bill to authorize the appropriation of supplemental funds for fiscal year 1966 AID economic assistance programs totaling \$415 million.

A significant portion of this supplemental request, \$275 million, is designed for use in South Vietnam. I traveled to Vietnam after the 1st session of the 89th Congress adjourned last year because I wanted to see for myself the existing conditions in this distant land where our servicemen are fighting to preserve and protect the freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

It is apparent that the mood of good will which prevailed when American troops first landed is showing definite signs of deterioration. There is a possibility that our relationship with the South Vietnamese people could further deteriorate as the full impact of American spending hits the economy and more of the technically skilled South Vietnamese move to cities adjacent to U.S. military installations where huge construction projects are being pushed to provide logistical support for our combat troops. One Cabinet Minister in the South Vietnam Government told me with a trace of irony in his voice, "An American staff sergeant earns more per month than I do."

In my opinion, the only way the war in South Vietnam can be won is to win the battle for the hearts and the minds of the people.

The past year has demonstrated that a clear and unequivocal military policy by the United States could produce a rapport with the South Vietnamese Government for the benefit of the country. If our policy is just as clear with respect to the South Vietnamese Government instituting social, political, and economic reforms, can we not expect a greater response in this direction than ever has occurred in the past? I think that the United States must not only implore, but demand, that the Ky government overhaul its policies and the apparatus of its administration to guarantee a maximum of public acceptance and identification with the national government in Saigon. We must insist on general elections at the earliest possible time. We should not be satisfied with lip service being given to reform. We should insist that positive steps be taken.

It is not an easy task to remake a poor nation into a developed nation. Nor is it easy for the government of a poor nation to gain the confidence of its people. I was told by U.S. officials in Vietnam that 70 percent of the people are illiterate. A majority of South Vietnam's 15½ million population is tied to the land

in little better than subsistence agriculture. Only 18 percent of the children who complete primary school go on to secondary school and a significant proportion of the children never go to school at all. There are over 1 million refugees from the combat zones banded together in numerous camps awaiting relocation of the cessation of hostilities to return to their own farms and villages. There are few schools available for children of refugees and sanitation conditions in the camps are primitive at best. Disease is widespread throughout the country. One Navy corpsman told me that if there were enough soap available for the people in the villages and if they would use it, disease could be cut down 50 percent.

The people do not have a sense of national identity the way Americans do. The nation-state is for us the focal point of political loyalty, economic strength, social order, and defense against foreign enemies. The Vietnamese have social and cultural homogeneity; but never having known true statehood, and after being a colony of France from 1885 to 1954, they have but limited loyalty to the National Government. An overwhelming majority of village dwellers in the countryside have never seen a high National Government official, let alone never having voted for one. Too often the only contact the people have with the Federal Government is the payment of taxes, with no services or security being provided in return. Living as many of them do in wretched physical circumstances, they are relatively easy targets for Communist propaganda and promises. There is no way of avoiding the fact that 22 percent of the population and over 50 percent of the land in South Vietnam would not be under the control of the Vietcong if the people themselves were not actively or tacitly accepting the Communist presence. The problem is intensified because of poor communications between villages. Roads are few in number and travel is made hazardous as a result of repeated Vietcong ambushes along the highways. Telephones and telegraph are nonexistent in many parts of the countryside. The fact that the people have no national identity does not mean this must always be so.

The United States has entered into a substantial economic aid program for Vietnam. In fiscal year 1965, we contributed \$283.2 million. We have already obligated all of the \$255.5 million appropriated for fiscal year 1966 and we are asking for supplemental funds in the amount of \$275 million. The object of our program is to develop the resources of the country and to give the rural and urban population a feeling that there is a better life obtainable in the future and that their own government is better able to provide it than the Communists. Among other things, the United States is supplying agriculture extension services, fertilizers, pesticides, and medical care; building roads, schools, and hospitals, and helping develop local government administration in rural areas.

In my opinion, we are not doing enough for the approximately 800,000 refugees that are currently in the South Vietnam Government controlled areas. I visited

a number of camps where the conditions were very poor. Sanitation facilities are often nonexistent and educational opportunities for the children are totally unsatisfactory. A small vocational training course has been initiated to provide technical training for less than 1,500 persons. This is insufficient to have any real impact upon the refugee population. There is no question that South Vietnam is going to need an increasingly large number of trained technicians to support industrial growth. An effort should be made to train these refugees who sit in their camps all day without work. By doing so, many of these homeless people could be kept temporarily occupied and made productive members of the society, rather than charity cases draining off an inordinant amount of the nation's limited capital resources to keep them alive. It is commonly pointed out by AID officials that most of the refugees are women and children who are waiting to return to their villages and to their agricultural way of life. This does not mean, however, that many of these refugees would not prefer an education and vocational training so that they could take up a new life in the urban areas.

It has also been suggested by AID officials that if life is made too pleasant in the refugee camps that the refugees will not want to go back to their farms and work for a living. No one is suggesting that the refugees be made permanent welfare cases. What I am saying is that the refugee children should be able to receive as good an education as other children in the country. To date the children of the refugees are offered a substantially inferior education, with many refugee camps not providing any schools at all. Only an infinitesimal percentage go to secondary school upon the completion of primary school. This situation must be corrected.

I am disappointed that of the \$275 million requested for supplemental economic assistance to South Vietnam in a current fiscal year, only \$11.6 million is allocated to refugee programs. What is more, \$10 million of the \$11.6 million is already obligated to pay past debts. This leaves only \$1½ million in fiscal year 1966 to finance programs designed to aid approximately 800,000 refugees. This is dangerously insufficient to ease their condition and to promote their allegiance to the Government of South Vietnam.

It is significant that the refugees are made homeless by terrorist activities of the Vietcong, American, and South Vietnamese bombardment and combat in and around their villages. The refugees have made a positive commitment to come over to the side of the South Vietnamese Government. They did not go to the Vietcong secured areas. We must not allow this large population of tired, frightened, and homeless people to become so frustrated in their refugee camps by lack of concern for their well-being and inability to carry on productive lives that they become a force for sedition rather than a force in support of the South Vietnamese Government. There can be no excuse for failure to take positive action regarding the present condi-

tion and future destiny of the 800,000 refugees in South Vietnam today.

I am voting in favor of this supplemental appropriation bill because I feel that it is needed. It is essential that an economic and social revolution accompany our military efforts in Vietnam. Our economic assistance is the critical prerequisite to such a revolution taking place. Although we know there is a corruption in South Vietnam and although we know that much of our AID funds are siphoned off to the personal advantage of numerous corrupt officials, still the program is necessary. We must work to tighten up the administration of the program, but we must not sacrifice the program itself because of certain failures in that administration. I would like to say in conclusion that I think that David Bell, the Director of AID, has done a magnificent job in bringing new imagination, talent, and leadership to our economic assistance program. I am confident that he has the ability, if any man has it, to insure the success of the AID program in South Vietnam.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join with my colleague in urging favorable consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill before us. I should like to speak particularly on behalf of the \$25 million amount contained in that bill for assistance to the Dominican Republic.

It is worth noting, that the provisional government of Hector Godoy operates under the most severe handicaps. Thirty years of dictatorship followed by political instability and the destruction and hatred of civil war have left the Dominican Republic ill prepared to create a democratic society.

Yet, that is what the Organization of American States, the United States and Dominicans of good faith are committed to today. Elements of both left and right would exploit the heritage of tyranny and the present unrest to gain control for themselves, but the provisional government is determined to steer a course toward democracy, and it is in this, that additional assistance is needed from the United States.

Support of the provisional government and of the Organization of American States by the United States has helped to prevent anarchy in the country. Gradually, that assistance is being shifted from emergency stopgap aid to development assistance that will build a foundation upon which the people of the Dominican Republic can create a democratic society.

The provisional government has had the support of OAS troops from the United States and Latin American countries. Technical and economic assistance has been given to prevent economic deterioration and to give the Dominicans themselves time to raise from the ashes a new society.

The cost has been great. Yet, if dollars, and technical assistance, and an understanding heart can be substituted for bloodshed and destruction, we must be prepared to pay the price. A hemisphere at peace, where men may lead good lives and may know social justice is our goal. It was the goal of the na-

tions that met at Punta del Este in 1961. It is the goal of the Alliance for Progress. It must remain our goal until every vestige of hopelessness and violence born of desperation is banished from our hemisphere.

We are asked now to do that which is deemed necessary to give the Dominicans time to conduct an orderly election in June and to install a democratic government. For now, I am convinced that the immediate task of supporting the provisional government warrants our making available the supplementary amount requested by the President.

I urge my colleagues to approve the supplemental appropriation that is before us.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I support the administration's request for a \$25 million supplemental appropriation for the Dominican Republic.

The Dominican economy has been beset with a number of enormous problems in recent years. Following the fall of Trujillo, the Dominican people demanded a better way of life and something more than a subsistence wage. High wage levels, however, created increased demands for imports, the meeting of which created balance-of-payments difficulties. Spending for consumption of imported goods left little for capital investments, public or private.

In 1964, this situation was further complicated by a spectacular drop in sugar prices, in which the economic health of the country rests.

The civil war has severely dislocated economic activity in the country. Total production of goods and services has declined and unemployment has increased. Commercial activity in Santo Domingo still suffers from the turmoil of last April. Strikes and other disturbances continue to plague the country.

The U.S. objective in assisting the Dominican Republic is twofold. On the one hand we are providing aid to relieve immediate suffering, to build stable conditions conducive to the holding of free elections, and get a society moving again. One example is assistance to repair of irrigation ditches which both liberates a material resource and provides the opportunity to put human resources to work again. To this effort other nations of the hemisphere have contributed medical personnel and emergency food supplies.

At the same time, we are looking beyond immediate measures in an effort to help the Dominicans start the task of building for the long-term growth of their country. The United States is providing technical cooperation to advise the Dominican Government in long-range problems of administrative, fiscal, and monetary reform. We are assisting the stimulation and expansion of food crops and the diversification of agriculture. We are helping community development projects including rural access roads, reforestation, and community centers, in all of which the great part of the job is borne by the local populace. Teacher training and vocational education are also being assisted in other efforts to reach the people directly.

While today, the most immediate need is for short-term assistance, assistance which has to date directly affected more than 200,000 people, this effort is a step only in a long-term drive to help a nation help itself. I urge support of this appropriation as a measure vital not in putting out a fire but as a link in a program to build an environment in which fires will become less likely.

The threat of Communist subversion is still very real in the Dominican Republic. Cuba stands in the Caribbean as a constant reminder of Communist ability to seize power by force and fraud.

Economic stability in the Dominican Republic and throughout Latin America is the best possible insurance against communism and that is the purpose of this appropriation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, for the past several years I have voted against foreign aid legislation. My reason has had a single purpose; namely, to register a protest against a program which in sum has been too often poorly conceived and poorly administered. By this I do not mean to say that there has been no good in our foreign aid programs. But I determined some time ago that the only way to encourage the necessary reforms was to put the executive branch on notice that there were those in Congress who are dissatisfied enough with its overall operation to give it a vote of no confidence.

The bill before the House today is a supplemental request to the bill which I voted against last session. Its basic purpose is to support our efforts in southeast Asia and especially in South Vietnam. While I am certain there are many aspects of this program that could and should be improved, I do not believe that this crucial hour with so many boys in daily combat is the time to register a protest which might in any way be construed to indicate a lack of support on my part for our overall effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, because the attention of the American people is generally focused on reports from the war front in Vietnam, little is known of our fight to provide a permanent line of defense in the struggle for men's minds in Vietnam.

With cement, roofing materials, and technical assistance supplied by AID, the people of Vietnam are building thousands of classrooms throughout the countryside. Of 9,000 classrooms constructed in the last 5 years, 1,600 were put together by the villagers themselves—a fact which has not been lost on the Vietnamese. Knowing the value that the Vietnamese people place on the education of their children, the Communist guerrillas hesitate to destroy these new schools.

The steady accumulation of teaching facilities—made possible by the assistance of U.S. aid—now embraces half of all the primary school age children of the country. And AID is introducing practical subjects into the public school system to help the people solve their immediate problems; to grow better crops, improve their health, and raise standards of nutrition.

More than 14 million textbooks have been distributed by AID, and in the na-

tion's four normal schools and 21 industrial schools, AID is helping to train teachers in new techniques of practical instruction. The normal schools are now graduating more than 2,000 teachers a year.

In addition to equipping and improving these permanent training institutions, AID is helping to set up rural training programs to meet the demand for teachers in the villages. Local citizens are being prepared to take over classrooms after 3 months of intensive instruction. In one region of the country, the emergency sessions have provided nearly 600 new teachers. By way of incentive, the Vietnamese Government has increased the monthly rate of pay from \$6 to \$14—well above the average per capita income of the people as a whole.

A U.S.-financed television network is being set up to extend public education to every hamlet in the country. "Airborne classrooms" will be broadcasting courses to television receivers in community centers around the country. This new TV circuit represents an important advance in the war on ignorance as well as a way of answering the Communist propaganda being circulated by the Vietcong.

These are additional reasons why we must support H.R. 12169—to win the peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, the request for supplemental AID appropriations which we are considering today will make possible the expansion of certain AID programs, particularly in the field of agriculture.

As a result of the President's Honolulu meeting with Premier Ky and the Vice President's tour through southeast Asia, the United States is planning to step up its programs of assistance to the rural areas of Vietnam.

In addition to the food-for-freedom program, AID is already conducting numerous other programs to help raise the level of living of rural people in Vietnam. These existing programs will form the basis of the expanded programs.

In Vietnam today, AID is conducting programs in four agricultural subject-matter areas as follows: First, agricultural service and extension; second, crops and livestock production; third, credit and cooperatives; and fourth, agricultural resources development.

Some accomplishments to date are:

First. Extension training: The 1,004 Vietnamese agricultural extension agents have received valuable training from AID specialists through a systematic in-service training program. After having their own skills upgraded, these Vietnamese extension workers have assisted 1 million farmers in increasing their agricultural production and in raising their level of living.

Second. Assistance to youth: During 1965, the number of 4-T club members reached 46,454 in 1,200 clubs. These are the equivalent of 4-H Clubs in this country.

Third. Agricultural research: Since 1962, agricultural research stations released more than 20 high-yielding varieties of field crops and vegetables.

Fourth. Participant training: Between 1951 and 1965, 611 Vietnamese received special agricultural training in the United States or in a third country under the AID participant training program.

Fifth. Information program: In 1965, AID assisted the GVN in producing over 3 million leaflets and booklets and over 230,000 posters and wall newspapers. Also, AID helped to produce 45 radio tapes, 514 radio broadcasts, and 22,000 technical magazines for use by professional agricultural workers.

Sixth. Sewing machines: In 1965, our AID mission distributed 1,000 sewing machines to needy rural families and leaders.

Seventh. Fisheries: In the fisheries program, AID assisted in establishing 79 fishing cooperatives with 17,000 members. Also, fish production has increased from 52,000 tons in 1955, valued at VN\$3.3 billion, to 368,000 tons in 1965, valued at VN\$15 billion. Approximately 10,500 powered junks are now in operation, an increase of 6,900 since 1962, and 50,000 sets of improved fishing gear have been distributed. There are now 15 fish-landing facilities to assist marine fishermen.

Eighth. Livestock: Swine production increased from 1,694,000 head in 1955 to 3,600,000 in 1964. The chicken population increased from 16,655,000 in 1960 to 22,401,000 in 1964. About 33,000 improved chickens and 315,000 hatching eggs were distributed or sold at nominal prices from January 1964 to May 1965. There are 27 commercial farms with an average flock of 5,000 birds each.

Ninth. Fertilizer: Approximately 276,000 metric tons of fertilizer were imported in fiscal year 1965 as compared to 42,877 metric tons in 1955. This fertilizer was used by 700,000 farmers on about 2 million acres and provided approximately VN\$1.5 million additional farm income.

Tenth. Plant protection: For the purpose of increasing agricultural production, assistance was given in setting up a plant protection service, training the local staff, and providing necessary equipment. Through this system, crop losses from insects, diseases, and rats were reduced by 50 percent between 1961 and 1965. About 360,000 farmers participated in antirats campaigns in 1964 using 39,000 tons of rat poison. They killed an estimated 38 million rats, saving about 95,000 tons of food. In 1964, about 600 tons of insecticides were used by 500,000 rice farmers and 2,000 vegetable farmers. The program saved about 150,000 tons of rice.

Eleventh. Irrigation and water resources: Since 1954, improved practices in irrigation canals, flood protection, and salt water control have been applied to 610,000 acres. In 1965, approximately 24 miles of new irrigation canals were completed and 5 miles rehabilitated; 42 dams were built or restored which benefited 27,740 acres of land.

These accomplishments under existing AID agricultural programs should be a source of pride and satisfaction to all of us. Our affirmative vote on this request for supplemental appropriations will make possible the expansion of these

vital programs and bring new hope and progress to the rural people of Vietnam.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the measure before the House of Representatives, H.R. 12169 to authorize appropriations of supplemental funds of \$415 million for fiscal year 1966 for economic assistance programs.

The funds previously appropriated to AID for this fiscal year have not met the needs in a few of the important danger areas of the world, particularly Vietnam, for which the bill now under consideration provides \$275 million in supporting assistance funds.

We know that the problem in South Vietnam is the determined effort of North Vietnam to impose its will by force. We know that Hanoi has sent arms, and tens of thousands of armed and trained men—including units of the North Vietnamese Regular Army—into South Vietnam. This is why U.S. forces are in that country. We will continue to repel this aggression while we persist in our efforts toward a peaceful solution. These efforts to date have been numerous, and in the past months have been carried into every major capital of the world. They have brought no encouraging response from Hanoi. Even while we halted our bombing of North Vietnam, the military operations of the north continued.

The expansion of Communist aggression has called for the increased military response of the United States and, thus, added to the task of AID. Our economic assistance programs in South Vietnam are as important as our military assistance. We must, together with other free nations of the world, reinforce economic and social progress in that country, so that a social revolution—as well as peace and freedom—can be obtained in southeast Asia.

I have said that the funds appropriated by Congress have not met the needs of AID; in fact, they do not cover even one-half of the currently estimated requirements for fiscal year 1966. Two principal elements are involved in the request for supplemental funds: First, to meet the rising threat of inflation, \$175 million is needed to finance the importation of food, drugs, and other commodities; and second, \$100 million is required for new or enlarged Government activities in rural areas.

I also support the request for the following additional funds included in H.R. 12169: First, \$7.5 million each in supporting assistance for Thailand and Laos, to assist them in developing and maintaining economic and political stability, and to withstand increasing Communist pressures; second, \$25 million for the Dominican Republic, where last April's revolution resulted in economic and political instability, and where we—with the Organization of American States—are determined to help the provisional government reach a stable environment prior to the coming elections; and third, \$100 million to replenish the now-exhausted AID contingency fund.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure in its entirety.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the Republic of Vietnam is presently engaged in a courageous struggle for survival

against the threat of Communist subversion. Despite the long and difficult war, the Vietnamese are determined to create a new nation, and the institutions essential to sustain that nation, during the years ahead. Whether you talk to a farmer working in the ricefields or to a high Government official, you will quickly learn that the people of Vietnam place a high value upon educational opportunity. Consequently, the war against the Vietcong has not obliterated this goal or weakened the resolve of the people to improve educational opportunity. Instead, it has created a strong sense of urgency which is shared by both the Vietnamese Ministry of Education and the AID mission.

The program of educational assistance, which was conceived jointly by the representatives of Vietnam and the United States, has been characterized by two approaches. First, a long-range program was organized to develop a system of education which will produce the trained manpower required for social and economic progress. This system is planned not only to facilitate the transfer of knowledge and the training of skills, but also to assist in creating a society which will initiate and successfully absorb social and economic change.

A second major thrust has been the development of a special-impact program which offers the benefits of education to rural people. This program has limited, immediately attainable goals and will offer tangible evidence to the Vietnamese villagers that their government is interested in their welfare and is utilizing its resources and personnel to meet their needs.

With these two approaches in mind, AID's educational assistance to the Republic of Vietnam has been largely concentrated in four principal projects: First, hamlet schools; second, instructional materials; third, vocational education; and fourth, teacher training.

The hamlet school program was initiated in 1963 to expand elementary educational opportunities as rapidly as possible. This grassroots project has resulted in 3,203 classrooms in addition to 1,600 self-help classrooms that were constructed by the villagers themselves. More than 5,000 teachers have been trained through special 90-day courses. Programs for 1966, 1967, and 1968 call for annual goals of 2,500 classrooms and 4,000 teachers. At the ratio of 60 children per classroom—the typical class size in Vietnam—this program has provided schooling for 320,000 Vietnamese boys and girls. In the future, thanks to the AID program, many thousands more will have their first opportunity to attend school.

In a typical Vietnamese classroom, the children do not have books. To correct this situation, an instructional materials project was organized to provide textbooks and other educational aids such as maps and charts. Committees composed of Vietnamese teachers, artists, and editors, with an American adviser, have produced manuscripts at a phenomenal rate in fields such as arithmetic, health, history, and geography. These books were printed in Manila, Hong Kong, and Saigon. The Republic of China has printed

500,000. Australia will print and deliver 1,200,000 this spring. All together, more than 7 million books have been printed and shipped to Vietnam. In 1966, an additional 5 million will be printed and delivered. For an average of 22 cents per copy, more than 1,600,000 Vietnamese children will carry these books into hamlets and homes throughout the 43 provinces of Vietnam, offering visible proof to their inhabitants that the Government of Vietnam and the people of the United States share a deep concern for their future.

Within the framework of vocational education, the Republic of Vietnam has been assisted in four major divisions of training. In the trade-technical program, AID has constructed, equipped, and developed four polytechnic schools which will each accommodate 800 students. These schools offer courses in fields such as forging and welding, machine shop, auto mechanics, electricity, woodworking, drafting, and diesel mechanics. More than 3,000 students are enrolled in these schools.

At the Phu Tho Polytechnic School in Saigon, 4-year and 2-year college-level teacher training courses have been established, under the competent advisory assistance of the Southern Illinois University contract team, which will make Vietnam largely self-sufficient in the training of vocational teachers and eliminate the need for an extensive program of study in the United States.

More than 6,635 Vietnamese students are enrolled in all types of secondary level trade and technical schools. With continued support of the existing programs, and the development of short-term trade training programs, over 10,000 students will be provided with an opportunity to acquire useful skills.

In the field of agriculture, 3 secondary schools—with an enrollment of 1,300 students—have been established with AID assistance. In Saigon, a college of agriculture, with an enrollment of 320 students, offers a 4-year curriculum which includes courses in the general fields of animal husbandry, horticulture, agronomy and agricultural engineering. These schools will be expanded and improved in future years.

Presently under construction are 20 2-year rural trade schools which will offer courses to elementary school graduates as well as short-term courses for adults and out-of-school youths in carpentry, metalworking, bricklaying, masonry, engine mechanics, and handicrafts. The basic purpose of these schools will be to meet local community needs rather than to follow a stereotyped national curriculum. Provision is made, however, for students to follow an educational program leading to secondary and higher education.

The Ban Me Thuot technical school, which is part of this program, offers a 4-year trade training program to elementary school graduates from the mountain Provinces of Kontum, Pleiku, Phu Bon, and Darlac. These courses are patterned to meet the unique needs of the Montagnards. Seventeen schools are now under construction with one, the Long Xuyen rural trade school, completed and in op-

eration. Each school will have an enrollment capacity of 300 to 400 students.

At present, there is only one engineer training institution in Vietnam, located at the National Technical Center at Phu Tho, Saigon. A 4-year curriculum is offered in electrical, civil, and mechanical engineering as well as a 3-year technician training program in these same areas. A 4-year marine navigation course is also offered. A new 3-year technician training course in chemical technology was opened in fiscal year 1964. Currently, there are 792 students enrolled in the entire college. A survey of engineering has been completed, and a program to improve the quality and quantity of the courses is now being considered.

Vietnam has received substantial assistance from AID in the field of teacher training. Four normal schools, which are capable of enrolling 2,100 prospective elementary teachers, have been built and equipped. A laboratory elementary school enrolling 450 children and an in-service center designed to upgrade teachers and administrators have also been completed. The teacher training program has been improved and expanded from a 1- to a 2-year program.

In the area of secondary education, improvements include the construction of new colleges of education, for training teachers, and attached model demonstration high schools at the Universities of Hue and Saigon. Now in full operation, these facilities will graduate over 500 new teachers annually. They will also provide comprehensive secondary school opportunities for more than 1,800 high school students in an environment featuring better methods of teaching, new approaches to curriculum, and innovations in administrative practices. Currently, 190 teaching candidates are enrolled in a special 1-year training program at the University of Saigon in an effort to expand educational opportunities in the first year of the secondary school program.

Despite the ravages of war, considerable progress has been made through the AID program in expanding and improving the educational opportunities of Vietnamese youth. It is obvious that additional efforts will be required if we are to fulfill the task of providing the human foundations to support the survival and growth of the courageous Vietnamese nation. I believe every American will welcome the opportunity to share in this task.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the supplemental economic aid appropriation for Vietnam. In our efforts to combat the so-called "wars of national liberation," those thinly disguised but effective tools of the international Communist conspiracy to take over developing countries, we have come to realize that economic and social measures are equally, if not more important than military measures. This means that a very heavy responsibility devolves upon the civilian programs of counterinsurgency. The Agency for International Development has the largest share of this civilian responsibility. It

deals with the very roots of insurgency in working to alleviate the grievances of the people on which the Communists capitalize in seeking and gaining support of the population in these "wars of national liberation."

In preventing, as well as in stopping, these Communist-operated political wars, the efforts of the AID are indispensable. In Vietnam, the AID has a specially designed and unique program for reinforcing our political and military efforts. Not only does it alleviate the suffering of hundreds of thousands of refugees, but it has programs for assisting the Government to be more responsive to the needs of its people and thereby demonstrate that our way of life in the free world offers a better alternative than communism.

Such things as self-help projects and medical care in the rural areas, in the districts and in the provinces, constitute an orderly social revolution and a reinforcement of the essential political development which is required to sustain military victory. Indeed, if we attain military victories, as we expect to continue to do, they are in danger of going for naught, after blood and suffering on the part of our noble U.S. servicemen and the valiant armed forces of the Government of Vietnam, unless economic and social progress, such as that which is supported by the AID, is not only continued but accelerated. That would be made possible by our affirmative action on this supplemental appropriation for Vietnam.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I was elected to Congress I am going to support a foreign aid authorization bill.

When a nation is at war then it becomes mandatory we make every effort to win that war. I consider this bill an integral part of our effort to achieve peace in Vietnam.

In my mind these funds are essential to the success of our operations in Vietnam. I am convinced that to withhold such funds would mean a lessening of our chances of success. These funds are for import financing, for rural construction, for port expansion, for refugee relief, and for development. They have equal importance with our military effort itself.

The casting of this vote does not mean I have changed my view concerning many aspects of foreign aid. To the contrary, most of the criticisms I have made in the past years are still valid.

This vote is cast to support an extraordinary effort which our country is making and reflects extraordinary support of that effort.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, in considering the present legislation, I would like to point out what appears to be a significant and encouraging new U.S. foreign policy emphasis on active assistance in the process of peaceful social and political reform and economic development in southeast Asia.

Most Americans, I am sure, will applaud this hopeful sign of our determination to provide forward-looking leadership in that troubled part of the world for the struggle to conquer the age-old

enemies of hunger, disease, and ignorance, and to build the basis for democratic institutions and free elections.

This more positive attitude toward solving the problems of the underdeveloped world is certainly welcome, for it seems to represent a major public shift in our foreign policy approach. And it could well mean a move away from what had come to be viewed as a basically defensive post-Korean conflict stance—aimed primarily at stabilizing the status quo in Asia.

The new approach calls for a more dynamic attitude designed to help meet the rising expectations of Asia's restless millions by providing urgently needed self-help assistance in such important fields as education, health, agricultural production, industrial development, community water and sewage facilities, village security, refugee resettlement, and tax and land reform.

In addition, we are now actively promoting the spirit of regional cooperation in southeast Asia by participating in the huge Mekong River development project, which will provide tremendous power, irrigation, flood control, and related economic benefits to each of the neighboring Mekong Basin countries of Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.

Another very promising endeavor which we are fully backing is the newly created 27-nation Asian Development Bank with headquarters in Manila. This further example of worthwhile regional cooperation may prove to be one of the most effective long-range financial tools to develop Asia's virtually boundless human and natural resources—and help lift the burden of poverty that has been her lot since ancient times.

A fourth new U.S. foreign policy initiative is also designed to meet the turbulent challenge of the emerging nations. This is the recently announced food-for-freedom program to greatly increase American agricultural exports to food-shortage countries.

Besides harnessing our own amazing food-producing capacity to help fulfill the immediate pressing needs of an exploding world population, this program will also serve as a means to stimulate expanded local food production in the underdeveloped nations themselves.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am, of course, vitally concerned with these significant events on the international scene, for they seem to foreshadow a more dynamic American leadership role in promoting the cause of freedom.

Success in this progressive and forward-looking program of social reform and economic development, together with an end to the conflict in Vietnam, could help build strong and firm foundations for peace among all the nations of the world.

For that reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to give their overwhelming support to the supplemental foreign assistance authorization measure presently before the House—as an expression of endorsement for this hopeful and encouraging development in American foreign policy.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time on this side.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "\$369,200,000" and substitute "\$684,200,000".

(b) In the first sentence, after "President" insert ", without regard to section 649."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"(c) Immediately after the first sentence, insert the following:

"Funds appropriated under this section after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in the following countries and within the following dollar limitations: Not to exceed \$275,000,000 shall be available solely for use in Vietnam, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Laos, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Thailand, and not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing whatever complicated about this amendment. It neither takes from nor adds to the dollar amounts. It simply earmarks the bulk of the funds contained in this bill for spending in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and not somewhere else in the world.

I call your attention again to the fact that in this bill there is not one word which designates the purpose for which these funds should be spent—the purpose that I am sure we in the House of Representatives intend that they should be spent.

It has been said it would be unrealistic to designate where these funds ought to be expended. Well, nothing could be more realistic than to designate where they are to be expended. I would say to the gentleman who made that remark only a few moments ago that he serves on a committee which authorizes the expenditure of a good deal of money. I have heard him quite often criticize the flexibility and castigate those on the majority side for failing to write into legislation restrictions on the expenditure of funds. I am surprised that here today that he would say it is unrealistic to specify where these funds are to be spent.

One of the purposes of this bill and one of the purposes of all bills authorizing the expenditure of funds is to direct how and where the money shall be spent. That is all my amendment does. Anything less than that is an abdication of control on the part of the House of Representatives.

So I offer my amendment in the hope that the chairman will accept it and then we can go on from here.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish the gentleman would examine very carefully what is involved here. I am sure he did not when he drew up his amendment consider the borrowed money, \$63 million and some hundred thousand that has already been borrowed in this program, \$27,700,000 from the International organizations and \$36 million from supporting assistance funds in other countries in southeast Asia. Now with the limitation imposed by the gentleman's amendment, you are going to bar absolutely the repayment of these borrowed funds amounting to almost \$64 million.

Mr. GROSS. This amendment makes available exactly the same amount of money as is made available in the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, but you put a limitation on it.

Mr. GROSS. All it does is to prohibit transferability, and put it to the use for which it is intended.

Mr. MORGAN. The way I read the gentleman's amendment, you provide not to exceed \$275 million solely for use in Vietnam, \$7.5 million for Laos and \$7.5 million in Thailand and not to exceed \$25 million to be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic. You have it tied down tight.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. MORGAN. What are you going to do about the repayment of borrowed money?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Iowa knows my position generally on the question of mutual security legislation throughout the years. He and I have had some differences in this regard. I am going to support this legislation, but I think the gentleman's amendment is sound and proper.

If I could make a suggestion to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the question that he raises—how would the AID agency repay to the one or more of the other programs from which funds have been borrowed to support the effort in Vietnam, I would suggest that the AID agency over the years has been very prolific in deb obligating funds and reobligating them for other programs. This is not an uncommon thing. This has been done many, many times. So I am certain that in this instance here, they could deb obligate and they could reobligate from the funds that are then made available. This is done a hundred times a year or more by AID. I think it can be done here in these circumstances. I think in all honesty the gentleman from Iowa's amendment is a good one. It would more clearly identify specifically and spotlight where we are putting the money. I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to ask the gentleman—how can you borrow from an account when in the beginning it is appropriated in a lump sum and not earmarked for any project anywhere on the face of the earth? It is a lump sum appropriation and the administration could borrow from one fund to transfer from one fund. In reality under this appropriation they could justify the funds for a project in Vietnam and yet take it and build a summer resort in Morocco. Where are they borrowing from inasmuch as the funds are not earmarked to start with? What are you borrowing from? I think that is a question that should be answered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Far be it from me to try to answer when there are Members here who are more expert than I am, but I believe the gentleman from Louisiana knows better than anybody that the \$3.2 billion—whatever the exact amount was that was made available for fiscal year 1966—was not all in one account. It was in several accounts and they do have the right to transfer from one to another. Perhaps that is what the chairman of the committee was referring to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate proceed for an additional minute.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I will agree to the request for the additional time, but if there are any further requests for extension of time, I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. We do know that these funds are appropriated in lump-sum amounts. They are appropriated on an illustrative basis. The agency says, "We believe we need the money for these particular projects and these particular countries, but we have the right to spend the money anywhere we want to." I am making that as a statement of fact. Inasmuch as you do not allocate the funds, from what account are you going to borrow? I want that question answered, if I can get an answer.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the chairman of the committee will want to answer the question.

Mr. PASSMAN. It does not appear that he does.

Mr. GROSS. If the expenditure is not nailed down here and now they may well be borrowing this money for other purposes. As the gentleman has suggested, they may be borrowing it for the purpose of building summer resorts in Morocco.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think we would be establishing a very bad precedent here if we agreed to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, because down through the years in the foreign aid bill we have never specifically authorized x number of dollars for this country and y number of dollars for another and z number of dollars for another country.

If we start this, I promise you that there will be lobbyists around here lobbying for amounts of money for their countries the like of which we have never seen.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sure that the gentleman recalls that a few years ago we did earmark money for Spain.

Mr. HAYS. That is correct, but I think it was a mistake. I think I voted for it at the time. Experience taught me that we ought not to do it, because the next year—I do not want to mention the countries by name—ambassadors from a half dozen other countries came to see me in an effort to earmark an amount of money for their countries. If we do so again, we will have lobbyists around here the like of which we have not seen before.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do you not think it would be better to have the lobbyists here than over in the State Department?

Mr. HAYS. No; and I will tell you why. First, I do not think they are over there. Second, I am even more interested in another point about the gentleman's amendment.

I was out there, and I am very much worried about what is going to happen in Thailand, because that is the next target. In fact, they are moving in there right now. They are moving in from the north and from the south. I do not know whether \$7.5 million is enough for Thailand or whether it is not. But I do not want to tie the hands of the administration so that if they decide they have to meet this threat and they have to meet it fast, they cannot do it.

We might very well want to take some of this \$275 million that the gentleman wants to earmark for South Vietnam and use it in Thailand.

I give the Thais pretty high marks because they have stood up against the Communists. They have really stood up against China.

There was a cartoon not long ago in a magazine that showed Chou En Lai and

Mao Tse-tung looking at each other. One of them said, "I don't trust these Russians. They are too oriental."

I give the Thais high marks on that, too, because when the Chinese Ambassador—or at least I read this in the newspaper—called on the Prime Minister of Thailand to protest the use of the bases in Thailand for our Air Force, the Prime Minister looked at him straight in the eye and said, "You had better get some new spies. They are giving you wrong information. There are no American planes in this country."

In other words, he gave them back some of their own propaganda medicine, and I think it was good for them.

Of all the places I visited out there I was impressed about as much by the attitude of the Thais, who are a little country, who are close to the common frontier with the Chinese Communists, and who have not hesitated to stand up and be counted on our side. I do not want any amendments that will hamstring us if we in an emergency have to give them more than this amendment would earmark for them.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not true that as far as the borrowing is concerned, this money was borrowed from projects already programed and not expended?

Mr. HAYS. That is exactly correct.

Mrs. KELLY. Following that up, is it not possible that if agreed to, the amendment would limit any further appropriation or authorization under this basic law for the rest of this year?

Mr. HAYS. It would certainly limit it, and it might put more money than the gentleman from Iowa wants in the one place and less in another, depending on how much they have borrowed from these obligated funds and already obligated somewhere else. I do not think this is a very complicated situation.

Mr. ADAIR. There has been concern expressed here earlier today lest this money which is to go to southeast Asia should be diverted elsewhere. It is not the intent of the gentleman from Ohio that this money is in fact to be used in southeast Asia in furtherance of our effort?

Mr. HAYS. Certainly it is my intent that it is to be used in southeast Asia. I do not go so far on any appropriation as to say that, if the Chinese Communists attack in India, which is in southeast Asia, we could not use some of it there. It is not mentioned here, but we might. But I am sure it is the intent of all of us that it be used in southeast Asia, and in the Dominican Republic, which has been mentioned. But certainly I do not think that we ought to tie it down country by country and say "You are going to get so much" and "You are going to get so much."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us—an AID supplemental request for \$415 million—involves economic assistance funds. Because of the saddening death of Admiral Nimitz, we are not now considering the Department of Defense supplemental request.

Most of the funds requested—\$275 million in supporting assistance—will be used in Vietnam. While this is a much smaller amount than the funds required to continue our military effort, it is every bit as important.

The challenge in Vietnam is not simply a military challenge; it is economic and political. The brave people of South Vietnam must know that their hard struggle will result in a better future—their future and their children's future.

The farmers, schoolteachers, merchants, workers, mothers, students and soldiers must see that the seductions of the Communists are illusory; they must see that a future in independence and freedom will secure the benefits of social justice and growing prosperity—more schools, better health facilities, thriving farms, rising incomes and opportunity to advance.

I regard the additional funds requested by AID for use in Vietnam as indispensable to the efforts by the South Vietnamese themselves to secure this future.

Secretary Rusk has already testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee:

Without our AID programs we could win the major military battles in Vietnam and still lose the war and the peace.

Secretary Rusk added:

For this reason I regard our economic assistance program, although not nearly so large in scale, as equal in importance with our military assistance. We fully intend to reinforce the economic and social progress that South Vietnam has been making during a brutal war and in spite of unremitting destructive efforts by the enemy.

One hundred million dollars of this request for additional economic assistance funds for Vietnam is for rural construction and counterinsurgency activities. More than two-thirds of the funds for these projects will be used for activities outside Saigon.

These funds will be used for a variety of provincial operations. They are administered under exceedingly dangerous circumstances by some very brave AID representatives.

These funds will be used for rural schools, to complete the construction of 15 rural trade schools, and about 830 hamlet school classrooms. They will be used to repair many other schools which have been either destroyed or damaged by the Vietcong. AID expects that during the next 3 years, it will be possible to build 3,700 new classrooms and train 12,000 teachers. I cannot imagine a better way to demonstrate to the Vietnamese the benefits of a free and secure future.

About \$9 million is needed for the expansion of rural health facilities in Vietnam. Most hospitals in the provinces are simply inadequate. They are old, outmoded or deficient in essential requirements. Through AID programs, new hospitals are built. Additional funds are needed to support surgical

teams on detail to AID to assist provincial hospital operations.

Expanded assistance for agricultural improvements is also required. Our efforts in this area is one of the key tools in the campaign to win the support of the people. Agriculture and agricultural programs have suffered terribly from the savagery of the war. The Vietnamese farmers' land is often the battle scene; the agricultural technicians' access to the farmer is often limited by Vietcong activities. In spite of these great obstacles, some remarkable successes are being achieved through AID programs; progress must continue.

The list of AID efforts to improve the lives of the Vietnamese and support the war effort is long. Funds are needed for basic improvements in several municipal centers of South Vietnam, such as low-cost housing and sewerage and drainage requirements. Relief for refugees must be expanded. Warehouses must be built and ships leased for coastal and ocean supply operations; war-damaged rail facilities must be repaired; it is necessary to install temporary and permanent electric power services and construct workers' housing and training centers. Public safety and police improvement activities must be accelerated to help establish adequate levels of physical security for the Vietnamese people.

The \$175 million is also needed by AID in this fiscal year to help finance commodity imports to combat inflation. To cope with the severe inflationary pressures which threaten economic and political stability, the United States must expand the financing of commercial imports. For example, \$21 million is needed for rice imports; \$9 million for medicines and pharmaceuticals; \$12 million for petroleum products; \$50 million for iron and steel, and \$4.5 million for fertilizer imports. Over half of these commodities will be utilized in areas outside Saigon. Without this vital assistance, destructive inflation would overcome our efforts to maintain a sound economy in Vietnam in the midst of the war.

It cannot be denied that all of these requirements are expensive. It likewise cannot be denied that they are necessary if we are faithfully to support the aspirations of the Vietnamese people for a better life and support the valiant efforts of our own fighting men in Vietnam to win this future. There is no alternative—except defeat and surrender in this beleaguered land—to meeting this situation by providing the President the funds which are needed to do the job now.

The bill before you also contains requests for supporting assistance funds for three other troubled lands: Thailand, Laos, and the Dominican Republic—\$7.5 million are needed for Laos and Thailand each. In these countries, the peoples are faced with increasingly menacing Communist pressures. Funds are needed now to meet these threats by increasing non-military security activities financed by AID and intensifying rural development projects in vulnerable areas. In Thailand additional funds are required now to assist the Government of Thailand in its major expansion of the civil police program. To improve the effec-

tiveness of the border patrol and provincial police in combating Communist infiltration, additional helicopter, radio communications and weapons support is needed. Steps are also being taken to meet increasingly the needs of the rural populace, especially in the threatened northeast area of Thailand, by, for example, bringing potable water facilities to the villages there. This surely is the way to build the foundations of resistance to Communist intrusions.

In Laos new moneys are needed to attend to a variety of unanticipated needs. Refugee relief must be accelerated, airlift operations stepped up, and airport facilities improved. Additional funds for this year are needed to help the Government of Laos stabilize its influence and control in contested areas, especially through work with rural peoples.

In the Dominican Republic the United States has a vital interest in the realization of the elections which are now planned for June. The United States has provided large amounts of assistance to prevent the aggravation of the economic and political instability which followed last year's revolution. We must continue to provide budget support if we are to help the provisional government avoid the kind of chaos which would destroy the possibility of meaningful elections—\$25 million are needed in the next 4 months to foster a stable environment in the Dominican Republic.

The President has also requested Congress to provide AID with \$100 million in contingency funds to replenish funds already exhausted through use in emergency and trouble spots around the world. I heard Secretary Rusk when he testified:

It is absolutely essential that a sufficient amount of contingency funds be on hand for the remainder of this fiscal year to permit us to respond immediately and effectively to emergency situations or unforeseen requirements which engage the interests of the United States.

It is impossible to predict precisely if all these funds will be used or where they will be used. The point is that we must be prepared to deal decisively with unforeseen crises in southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, or wherever.

I would like to comment briefly on some of the supplemental views expressed by five minority members of the committee.

These gentlemen express concern about "graft, corruption and black market activities." These are real problems in the wartime situation of Vietnam. But the impression should not remain that the Vietnamese leadership is corrupt or indifferent to crime or that the management of U.S. military or AID efforts in Vietnam is lax. There are two distinct types of problems which occur in a large-scale war effort such as now exists in Vietnam. First is diversion or corruption involving our assistance programs. AID's auditors and end-use inspectors are in Vietnam working to keep such diversion to a minimum. Their record is good. As a matter of fact, the Controller of the Agency is in Vietnam right now reviewing and improving audit and inspection procedures.

The second type of problem is profiteering, black market operations and corruption in the economy itself. Many of the charges and reports concern this type of problem. Vietnamese civil authorities are being assisted by American police advisers in a major campaign to deal with such corruption. It is occurring—but it is being vigorously attacked.

The supplemental views question the need for additional funds for the contingency fund. They point out that none of the original \$50 million has been used in Vietnam. They do not mention the \$89 million special fiscal year 1966 contingency fund for southeast Asia—which has been needed and used in Vietnam—and which has been exhausted. I am sure that criticism would not be slow to come if the United States were not to deal effectively and promptly with emergencies and crises which might arise during the remainder of the year. As the supplemental views admit, contingency funds are not always fully used. As a matter of fact, AID has a good record since 1961 of not using contingency funds if they are not needed. If funds are left over, it is up to the Congress to reappropriate or not—and I am sure we can make that choice when the time comes.

The supplemental views complain of manipulation of funds by AID's borrowings from other programs to meet needs in Vietnam. They suggest that borrowing is evidence of over-funding of other programs. This is simply not the case.

What AID has done is "borrow" from programs where funds were not needed until the last part of the year. These borrowed funds will need to be replenished—some of them by the end of March.

The borrowing that has been done is in full compliance with the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act—provisions enacted by the Congress. Each of these has required a determination by the President that the transfer is necessary. And who can dispute the necessity of meeting urgent requirements in Vietnam.

I am pleased to note—at least from their statement that they are "in agreement with the majority of our colleagues"—that these gentlemen do intend to vote in favor of a foreign aid authorization. I commend them for it.

Mr. Chairman, the world we inhabit is precarious and fragile. Most all of us recognize the world responsibility as a world climate of stability and security, of progress and hope. We also recognize that the price for bearing these responsibilities is not cheap, and the best evidence of this recognition would be a vote in favor of the supplemental request at hand. Those funds for economic assistance support in the truest sense our own best aspirations for the world in which we live.

The cruel dilemma of Vietnam hangs heavy over our Nation. It hangs heaviest over the head of President Johnson. Everyone can criticize or offer suggestions as to what should or can be done. However in the end the burden is his. The people of this country elected him our President and our Commander in

Chief. His judgment has never proven unworthy of the trust which the people of this country placed in him.

Some ask how did we get to Vietnam and this is a fair question that should be answered. Perhaps it is a time to trace the course which lead to Vietnam and place it in its proper perspective.

The Eisenhower administration on numerous occasions stated unequivocally that southeast Asia was of prime strategic meaning to the United States and that a threat to that region or to any one of the component countries, would also represent a threat to the security of the United States. In that period, when the Korean experience was quite fresh, aggressions against southeast Asia or Indochina were equated with the aggression against Korea in terms of significance to the United States and the free world.

In September of 1953 Secretary Dulles declared that the outcome of the struggle in Indochina "affects our own vital interests in the Western Pacific." In a speech 6 months later, Dulles referred first to the resources of southeast Asia and then stated:

The area has great strategic value. Southeast Asia is astride the most direct and best developed sea and air routes between the Pacific and south Asia. It has major naval and air bases. Communist control of southeast Asia would carry a grave threat to the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, with whom we have treaties of mutual assistance. The entire Western Pacific area, including the so-called offshore island chain, would be strategically endangered.

President Eisenhower appraised the situation last Wednesday (March 24) when he said that the area is of "transcendent importance."

A little later, Dulles stated that Communist conquest of southeast Asia "would seriously imperil the free world position in the Western Pacific" and he then explained the importance of Vietnam to southeast Asia as a whole:

We realized that if Vietnam fell into hostile hands, and if the neighboring countries remained weak and divided, then the Communists could move on into all of southeast Asia. For these reasons, the Eisenhower administration from the outset gave particular attention to the problem of southeast Asia.

Secretary Dulles in subsequent speeches put his position even more clearly when he said on one occasion that Chinese Communist aggression in relation to the Pacific or southeast Asia area "would be a deliberate threat to the United States itself," and on another occasion:

Communist armed aggression in southeast Asia would in fact endanger our peace and security and call for counteraction on our part.

Somewhat later, toward the end of 1954 the Secretary, speaking on the SEATO Treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that it would be reasonable to conclude if the Communists turned to armed attack in that region they were "starting on a course of action which is directly aimed at the United States; that we are the target."

Once more in 1959, when evidence began to come to light that North Vietnam was renewing its efforts to take over the south, President Eisenhower said:

The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom * * *. Our own national interests demand some help from us in sustaining in Vietnam the morale, the economic progress, and the military strength necessary to its continued existence in freedom.

It was in an awareness of this real interrelation of the security of the United States with that of southeast Asia that the U.S. Government negotiated and concluded the Southeast Asia Collective Defense—Manila—Treaty in 1954. This treaty which established the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, with Thailand, the Philippines, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States as members, was undertaken as a contract to defend southeast Asia. The nature of this contract will be discussed below.

The signers of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty for the United States were John Foster Dulles, H. Alexander Smith, and MIKE J. MANSFIELD. With the advice and consent of the Senate, the treaty was ratified by the President on February 4, 1955, and entered into force on February 19, 1955.

Article IV of the treaty provides:

1. Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of United Nations.

2. If, in the opinion of any of the parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any party in the treaty area or of any other state or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any state designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

In a protocol entered into simultaneously the parties unanimously designated "for the purposes of article IV of the treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam."

The United States, in a special understanding set forth in the treaty, limited its obligation "to act" under article IV(1) to cases of Communist aggression, including armed attacks by "the regime of Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam." The United States agreed in the event of other aggression or armed attack to consult under the provisions of article IV(2).

OBLIGATION TO ACT—INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE

In the event of armed attack as in Vietnam, each party is bound under article IV(1) to act "to meet the common danger." Article IV(2) "applies primarily to the threat of overthrow by subversive measures, internal revolution which might, perhaps, be inspired from without, but which does not involve open interference from without." This obligation is individual, as well as collective, and does not depend on consultations or agreement. This interpretation of the treaty obligation, widely held by the SEATO parties, was given formal expression in a joint communique issued by Secretary Rusk and Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman of Thailand on March 6, 1962:

The agreement of each of the parties to act to meet the common danger "in accordance with its constitutional processes" leaves to the judgment of each country the type of action to be taken in the event an armed attack occurs.

But each party is committed to act on its judgment that an armed attack has occurred:

The Secretary of State assured the Foreign Minister that in the event of such aggression, the United States intends to give full effect to its obligations under the treaty to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. The Secretary of State reaffirmed that this obligation of the United States does not depend on the prior agreement of all other parties to the treaty, since this treaty obligation is individual as well as collective.

Almost all the SEATO parties have endorsed this statement. None has registered objection.

In the current hostilities, the Republic of Vietnam has not requested formal collective action by the SEATO Council. However, at Vietnam's request, the United States has acted individually, and collectively with other countries, including several SEATO allies, to meet the common danger arising from the armed attack against "the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam." These measures are not actions by the SEATO Council, but they are actions in discharge of parties' obligations under the treaty.

SOUTHEAST ASIA—U.S. PEACE AND SECURITY

The meaning of the treaty commitment was underscored by Secretary Dulles in his report to the President:

The purpose of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty is the creation of unity for security and peace in southeast Asia and the Southwestern Pacific. * * * Although the United States has no direct territorial interest in southeast Asia, we have much in common with the people and governments of this area and are united in the face of a common danger that stems from international communism.

A week after the treaty was signed, Secretary Dulles explained to the Nation:

Any significant expansion of the Communist world would, indeed, be a danger to the United States, because international communism thinks in terms of ultimately using its power position against the United States. Therefore, we could honestly say * * * that Communist armed aggression in southeast Asia would, in fact, en-

danger our peace and security and call for counteraction on our part.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary Dulles said:

The language used here which has now become, I would say, almost conventional with reference to these treaties, makes perfectly clear the determination of our Nation to react to [Communist] armed attack.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported the treaty and protocol by a vote of 14 to 1. In its report, the committee made clear its understanding of the importance of the new commitment:

This treaty constitutes an important step in the evolution of U.S. policy to create a system of collective security in the West Pacific area. It is the latest addition to the protective network of the mutual defense treaties which have been concluded by the United States with Japan, Australia and New Zealand, the Philippines and Korea.

Designed to promote security and to strengthen the fabric of peace in southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific, the treaty is intended to deter aggression in that area by warning potential aggressors that an open armed attack upon the territory of any of the parties will be regarded by each of them as dangerous to its own peace and safety.

The principle underlying this treaty is that advance notice of our intentions and the intentions of the nations associated with us may serve to deter potential aggressors from reckless action that could plunge the Pacific into war. To that end, the treaty makes it clear that the United States will not remain indifferent to conduct threatening the peace of southeast Asia.

The committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that acceptance of these obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests. There are greater hazards in not advising a potential enemy of what he can expect of us, and in failing to disabuse him of assumptions which might lead to a miscalculation of our intentions.

For these reasons, the Committee on Foreign Relations urges the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty.

On February 1, 1955, the U.S. Senate approved the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty by a vote of 82 to 1. Senator Langer cast the lone negative vote. Thirteen Senators were absent and not voting, but with respect to each it was announced that if present and voting, he would vote "yea." Among the 13, 2 Senators were absent for illness: Lyndon B. Johnson and John F. Kennedy. The others were Barkley, BENNETT, Chavez, Daniel, DIRKSEN, Hennings, HRUSKA, McCarthy, MONRONEY, Potter, and Young.

The commitment to protect the Indochina states from Communist aggression was a central consideration emphasized by each of the four principal speakers in debate on the floor of the Senate supporting the treaty:

Senator GEORGE. The nations of the free world sustained a serious setback with the loss of northern Vietnam to the Communists. The peril to the southern area, the free territory of Vietnam, as well as to the

remaining associated states, Laos and Cambodia, is serious, continuing, and unrelenting. It is important that our Government should act promptly to give approval to this treaty as an act of confidence in the determination of other governments in the area to defend their freedom, individual liberty, and independence.

Senator SMITH. The net effect of this provision is to serve notice now and for the future to the Chinese Communists—and, I may say, to any Communists in the area * * * that they shall not encroach further on this area of free nations. They are no longer free to isolate and absorb the countries of southeast Asia, one by one. Laos or Cambodia or South Vietnam or Thailand cease to be individual entities on their timetable of conquest. That was taken care of by the special protocol which was added to the treaty at the time it was signed.

Senator MANSFIELD. The Southeast Asian Treaty is another part in the total pattern of strength which we have been trying to create throughout the free world. The armistice agreements at Geneva did not end the need for a pact in the southeast Pacific area; rather it emphasized it.

The treaty area is defined in the treaty itself and also in a protocol to the treaty which brings in Laos, Cambodia, and the free portion of Vietnam as treaty territory which, if attacked, would be under the protection of the treaty * * * those states welcomed the fact that the mantle of protection of the treaty was thrown around this area.

Senator WILEY. We all know what the loss of that part of the globe would mean to our own security. And we must not weaken our own resolve at this critical moment. Recent information, in contrast with pessimistic advice received earlier, appears to offer greater hope for a favorable outcome in free Vietnam. Surely now is not the time to dampen the morale of its people and its leaders.

INDOCHINA

The Manila Pact was negotiated in the shadow of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Korea and Indochina. When the Geneva Agreements on Indochina were signed by the French military command and the Communist Vietminh, the threat was clear that the Communists might attempt to take over the whole of Vietnam by internal subversion or armed aggression. At the conclusion of the Geneva Conference President Eisenhower declared that the United States would "not use force to disturb the settlement," but he warned "that any renewal of Communist aggression would be viewed by us as a matter of grave concern." The formal declaration by the U.S. Government at the 1954 Geneva Conference was worded more strongly. It stated we "would view any renewal of aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

At Manila, Secretary Dulles warned the conference of the insatiable ambition of international communism:

We know that wherever it makes gains, as in Indochina, these gains are looked on not as final solutions, but as bridgeheads for further gains.

It was to contain this bridgehead that the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was negotiated.

Secretary Dulles acknowledged that President Eisenhower and he "had hoped that unity would be forged in time to

strengthen the negotiating position of the free nations during the Indochina phase of the Geneva Conference. However, this proved impracticable. The Geneva outcome did, however, confirm the need for unity." The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was fashioned to meet this need.

REAFFIRMATION OF THE COMMITMENT

The U.S. commitment to the defense of South Vietnam derives from a basic conviction that the vital interests of the United States are engaged in the struggle of the peoples of southeast Asia to build societies in their own way free from aggression from the Communist powers. This commitment has been reaffirmed by three Presidents. With the support of Congress, each took the action that was necessary in his time to honor that commitment.

As early as October 1, 1954, President Eisenhower undertook to provide direct assistance to help make South Vietnam "capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." On May 11, 1957, President Eisenhower and Ngo Dinh Diem, President of the Republic of Vietnam, issued a joint statement which noted "the large buildup of Vietnamese Communist military forces in North Vietnam" and stated, *inter alia*:

Noting that the Republic of Vietnam is covered by article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem agreed that aggression or subversion threatening the political independence of the Republic of Vietnam would be considered as endangering peace and stability.

The two Presidents "looked forward to an end of the unhappy division of the Vietnamese people and confirmed the determination of the two Governments to work together to seek suitable means to bring about the peaceful unification of Vietnam in freedom in accordance with the purpose and principles of the United Nations Charter."

As North Vietnam's aggression mounted, President Kennedy declared, on August 2, 1961:

The United States is determined that the Republic of Vietnam shall not be lost to the Communists for lack of any support which the United States can render.

On December 7, 1961, President Diem appealed for additional support to meet North Vietnam's efforts to impose a Communist regime. In his reply of December 14, 1961 President Kennedy recalled the U.S. Declaration at the Geneva Conference of 1954 and reaffirmed that the United States was "prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence."

THE JOINT RESOLUTION OF AUGUST 7, 1964

President Johnson has reaffirmed these commitments many times, and, on August 7, 1964, the Congress adopted, by vote of 504 to 2, a joint resolution which stated the commitments as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the deter-

mination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

During the floor debate, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was asked by Senator COOPER whether the joint resolution fulfilled the requirement of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty that the United States act by constitutional processes:

In other words, are we now giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT answered directly:

I think that is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the way I would interpret it.

This provision is intended to give clearance to the President to use his discretion. We all hope and believe that the President will not use this discretion arbitrarily or irresponsibly. We know that he is accustomed to consulting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with congressional leaders. But he does not have to do that. I have no doubt that the President will consult with Congress in case a major change in present policy becomes necessary.

The joint resolution of August 1964 decided that the United States is prepared "as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." South Vietnam has asked for that assistance, and the President has taken the necessary steps in consultation with the Congress.

MUTUAL DEFENSE AGREEMENTS IN THE PACIFIC

The Manila Pact is only one of a number of bilateral and multilateral arrangements made to facilitate the exercise of the inherent right of collective self-defense acknowledged in article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The United States has entered into bilateral mutual defense treaties in the Pacific with Japan—most recently in 1960—Korea, 1953; the Philippines, 1954; and China, 1954; and it is a member of the tri-

partite Anzus pact with Australia and New Zealand, 1952.

Everyone of these treaties obligates the United States to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes—the formula used in the Manila Pact. This U.S. commitment, given in advance, to act in accordance with its constitutional processes in the event of Communist armed attack, is the linch-pin of the free world collective security system.

Thus U.S. commitment in South Vietnam, growing out of the Manila treaty and its protocol, must be met, in view of the aggression which is being mounted from North Vietnam, if the Manila treaty is to be regarded as a credible commitment. Were we not to help South Vietnam to defend itself, each one of the other SEATO nations which is under threat would most probably conclude that it could not count on American support, and we could expect to see accommodations being made to an aggressive communism which no one of the countries of southeast Asia could resist standing alone. Since our understandings with other allied countries in East and southeast Asia are stated in terms which are virtually identical to those in the Manila treaty, it is reasonable to assume that those countries too would feel obliged to reappraise their basic policies on the basis of a much more doubtful assumption of U.S. help in case they come under attack.

Under these circumstances we would have to assume that with the passage of time the bases in the Western Pacific to which we now have access would be shut off from us and that much territory and many resources now in friendly hands would no longer be so. Not only in that region but around the world the firm basis for the free world's system of collective security would have been badly if not irreparably shaken.

I think the vote today will demonstrate while we all seek peace we also possess an awareness of the commitment of this country. We have also a commitment to those young men who are doing the fighting that validates this commitment. They are entitled to our support.

The very risk that makes a treaty necessary in the first place carries with it the possibility that some day it may become operative. So too our responsibility becomes greater when our troops are committed to battle. Let us continue to discuss, let us continue to seek honorable negotiations but let us recognize that the answer to this challenge by communism like all its many challenges rests not with them. It rests with us.

Shall we continue to believe in ourselves? Shall we retain the faith of our convictions possessed of the knowledge that our ideals are more meaningful than our armies? Shall we retain our courage? For if we do then there is hope that Vietnam may be the dawn of a lasting peace in a world where men shall only fight their real enemies, misery, poverty, disease, and ignorance. I think we do.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the allotted time. I merely want to say, and I would like to add a footnote, that I have not studied this bill in detail. I do not know the fine points of it. I am not a member of the committee. But as I came in the door I heard the gentleman from Ohio make some remarks about the junior Senator from New York, and I might say that I am a good friend of the Senator from New York—

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman did not hear me correctly. I said the junior Senator from my own State. I do not bear any responsibility for the junior Senator from New York. I am a good friend of his, too.

Mr. DOW. Then I apologize.

Mr. HAYS. It is the junior Senator from Ohio that I was talking about.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I question the wisdom of my getting into this debate. I have profound respect for the distinguished chairman of this committee and every member of the subcommittee. It is his responsibility to get the authorization bill approved. Subsequently the Committee on Appropriations will have to consider the authorization.

I would like to be corrected if I am wrong. There is actually no borrowing going on anywhere. We may use the term "borrowing," but the allocation that the President made out of the United Organization funds is money that was unobligated. Had these funds been obligated, they could not have been retrieved. It was unobligated funds that the administration used, that is if they have been used. I am making a statement of fact, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course this money is already appropriated. The gentleman's bill appropriated it.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is not the question. Had it been allocated to specific projects?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course it has not been allocated to specific projects.

Mr. PASSMAN. Then you are not borrowing it, you are merely using funds that have not been obligated.

Mr. MORGAN. I am reading from the gentleman's own bill. International organization programs authorized by section 302, \$144,755,000. This is a program that they borrowed from.

I am reading now from the executive branch's section-by-section analysis that came up to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

AID has already "borrowed" \$36 million of essential supporting assistance programs and programs financed by the special southeast Asian contingency fund. In addition, \$27,700,000 has been temporarily transferred to supporting assistance from funds appropriated for volunteer contributions for international organizations.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, that is correct, but what you are actually doing is obligating funds for projects in South Vietnam from money that had not been obligated or turned over to

international organizations. I repeat, if the funds had been turned over to these international organizations they could not have been recalled or deobligated and reobligated as is the case with a multitude of other funds that are allocated or obligated on a bilateral basis, by the AID agency through the country and projects.

I just had a look at the budget. In the budget there are 15 different requests for foreign assistance of some type for fiscal year 1967. The total amount is \$8,505 million. I can assure the gentleman that this does not include any part of the Defense budget other than mutual security military assistance. May I say the total of unexpended funds from these 15 bills, to be dispersed in the future may exceed \$20 billion. The authorization request before you will merely enable the administration to increase the pipeline and I dare say not a dime authorized by this bill would actually be expended until 1968, if then.

The President laid the foundation for this supplemental when he came before the Congress last year. Read his message. He said that at some subsequent date, if we need the funds, we are going to ask Congress to appropriate them. I predicted at that time that there would be a supplemental in excess of \$1 billion, which would make it the largest foreign aid bill in the history of America if you picked up the international organizations and the other facets of foreign aid.

If the gentleman will accept this amendment and earmark these funds specifically for South Vietnam, for the first time since I have been a Member of Congress I will vote loud and clear for this particular authorization, but you have struck it out of the bill somewhere along the way. Some of you had the idea that you should earmark the funds in reading your own bill before the committee, but it has been stricken and again you are asking for an open end appropriation whereby you could or could not allocate and spend these funds in South Vietnam. Again it is on an illustrative basis. We may spend it there, but again we may not. So, if the gentleman will accept this amendment, inasmuch as he has made his case on the basis that the money was needed for South Vietnam, you will give some of us an opportunity to use the propaganda that is being used downtown that we are doing this on account of the war in South Vietnam. If that be true, then let us allocate it and let us put in the supplemental in the other body when it goes over sufficient money to pay back the pittance of \$64 million which you said we had borrowed. You have not borrowed it but have spent it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to bring this argument back into focus. This amendment was never considered in committee. No one introduced it, including anyone in the minority. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is inaccurate in that particular statement.

Now let me say this: The programs had been scheduled on a 12-month basis. We still have 4 months to go. Ninety-

six million dollars has already been borrowed from programs that have been scheduled. Twenty-seven million dollars has been scheduled for the 12-month program of the international organizations. This includes a multitude of organizations that would be unfunded for the balance of the 4 months if this amendment were adopted. Second, \$60 million has been borrowed from the Korean funds.

Now, it makes no sense to talk about fighting communism in South Vietnam if we allow programs in Korea to go unfunded. The rigidity of this amendment would preclude the transferability of the funds that we have here and have borrowed under previously allotted sums of money for programs of supporting assistance that would be used in Korea. Further, barring unforeseen circumstances, these funds will be used for the purpose stated by the administration; that is, the United Nations, Laos, Thailand, the Dominican Republic, and to reimburse funds previously borrowed, as I have stated.

This is a tremendously rigid amendment which has never been passed by any previous Congress that has considered the foreign aid bill. It is possible emergency situations in Laos or Thailand might require some transfer of funds. If we adopted this particular amendment, we would be unable to shift funds from Thailand to Laos or from Vietnam to Laos or Thailand. We would be unable to shift funds to the Dominican Republic or, if we had no further need for funds in the Dominican Republic and had a greater need in South Vietnam for them, we would be unable to do that. So, to reimburse the \$96 million we have already borrowed and which the committee of the gentleman from Louisiana has appropriated, it seems to me we cannot adopt this amendment. Even if we were thinking about it, what we would be doing is starting down an entirely new path and setting rigid precedents that have never been imposed on any President in any previous administration. So this has not been a well thought out amendment. I am sure the purposes are sincere. We are voting to support our effort in South Vietnam, but let it not be so rigid that we cannot fight communism wherever the emergency arises. By adopting this amendment what we would be doing is putting some programs on an 8-month basis when they have been scheduled and programmed on a 12-month basis.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I state again, and I am not quarreling with the gentleman, but the facts should be made known: You are not borrowing; you are merely allocating funds from previously appropriated, unobligated funds. You have nothing to pay back. I shall set forth that at the proper time.

If the gentleman will yield further, I want to ask one question: Using it in the extreme—I would not want to get into the hearings that are yet to be published—under the bill that is being con-

sidered, the authorization bill, if approved, funds out of this authorization could be allocated to Egypt, Indonesia, or any other of the 98 nations where foreign aid is being or could be dispersed in fiscal 1966, if the administration should so desire.

Is that not a statement of fact?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to answer the gentleman to the effect that the gentleman from Louisiana is quite aware of the program. But what we have done, in effect, is that while we might not have obligated these funds—and we are getting involved in semantics here—the fact of the matter is we have projected our program in Korea on a 12-month basis. We have borrowed \$60 million from that program. If we adopt this amendment, the rigidity of this amendment would preclude our paying back the supporting assistance fund in Korea the funds that we have already taken out of that fund to support our effort in South Vietnam. That is just how simple it is.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman did not answer my question, which is this: Could these funds be allocated to Egypt and to Indonesia?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The question is that they could be allocated to Korea.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has made my point.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I came over to the floor of the House this afternoon with the intention of voting for H.R. 12169. But I find, without the amendment, it will be impossible for me to vote for the measure.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that this money was earmarked for South Vietnam or at least for southeast Asia. But instead of earmarking the authorization, the Committee has merely amended section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by raising supporting assistance from \$369,200,000 to \$684,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], has raised a very valid objection. I have heard the gentleman from Louisiana say that the AID, the State Department, can obligate, reobligate, and deobligate all in the same day. If we pass this measure without earmarking the \$315 million for use in southeast Asia, the war in South Vietnam could end tomorrow and the State Department could spend all of the funds in Timbuktu the following week.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the authorization next week coming out of the House Committee on Armed Services. I serve on the House Committee on Armed Services. I raised a similar objection to the authorization in that committee. I feel that this is one of the valid objections to the operations of the foreign aid program. The Congress just does not exercise control over the operations of the foreign aid program. If this money is for use in southeast Asia, why should there be any objection to earmarking.

In my opinion—and I have been watching this for 6 years now in the

House of Representatives—it is an absolute exercise in futility for us to go through the procedure of authorizing and appropriating, when the State Department can obligate, deobligate, and reobligate all in the same day.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we have the same problem with reference to the defense appropriation, because the Pentagon and the Defense Department is doing the same thing through the process of reprogramming.

Now I did vote for the authorization in the Committee on Armed Services. That will be before the committee next week, but the problems are completely different. You can buy a bomb in the United States but you do not know whether it will be dropped in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, or Laos. But here we can exercise control at least to the extent of having it spent in Laos and Thailand and South Vietnam, which is the reason why the President has asked for this authorization.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to have one more clarification of this bill. I respect this great committee but as I understand the situation, no money has been "borrowed." I am familiar with this procedure. Actually what has happened and what does happen is that they allocated money or funded programs for South Vietnam that would have normally been allocated to other projects, programs, or countries. It is just a question now of whether you are going to get more money to allocate funds to Korea and to other programs that have been temporarily underfunded. Had the money been obligated then, of course, they could not have allocated it to another program or country. In reality the AID has not borrowed money. It makes a good case of argument but it is not factual. The AID is merely allocating funds that normally would have gone to some other country. If this authorization bill is approved, they will merely fund these programs at a subsequent date.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Do I understand the gentleman to say during the gentleman's discussion of this amendment that he is going to favor the same kind of amendment to the bill, H.R. 12335, when it comes on the floor Tuesday?

Mr. ICHORD. No. I do not think you could possibly limit the effort in fighting a war. I do think we should try to exercise more control even in the Committee on Armed Services. But when you are spending money for construction of airfields and for the purchase of numerous weapons and many new weapons that we are going to have come into play in South Vietnam, I do not think we can possibly earmark our authorization. We have made some progress, I will say to the gentleman, in the Committee on Armed Services. We did extend last year the authorization for line items to

include track vehicles. Previously we only authorized specifically for missiles, aircraft, ships, and other large items of hardware.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for 12 years I was a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Each year we had to consider the necessary appropriations for the funding of the total mutual security and/or AID program. In the process of considering this program, every year you ran into these kinds of terms. The executive branch of the Government would come before the committee and say, On an illustrative basis we are asking for this much money.

They could not be specific in pointing out the precise dollars for a precise project. The presentation was always illustrative. Each would also tell us that after the money was made available or the obligational authority was forthcoming, then they would program something—the precise dollar against a precise program.

Then they would eventually obligate the precise obligational authority against the project in a country. This was normal procedure. Then, of course, it was just as normal to deobligate if a project fell through or if its justification was not warranted after further consideration. Then that obligational authority would be made available for another project in another country and there would be a reobligation.

Now when comments are made that money is borrowed from one program or project from one country or another, I suspect—and I would like to see the books—that they had gone no further than programming at this stage of the fiscal year. Even if they had, knowing full well they will get this authorization and this appropriation—and I am for them—they can deobligate and they can reobligate. The net result will be purely a bookkeeping transaction.

It would be very interesting if the books were up here and we had people to look at them. I suspect the facts are they have gone no further than the programming. Even though they have they can deobligate and if they can deobligate, they can reobligate.

Let me just conclude with this observation, Mr. Chairman. It has been pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that this is an unusual circumstance. I agree. Maybe the fact that it is an unusual circumstance is the reason why we should earmark. It would justify earmarking here when we have not done so in the past. We are seeking on this occasion to indicate our full support for our program in Vietnam and in these associated areas in southeast Asia.

There is no better way in my judgment than to be specific with the earmarking as long as we are convinced that the earmarking will in no way interfere with the operation of the program.

I am confident if the books were laid right out on the table in the well of the House, the facts would be—yes the facts

would be—that they have not gone any further than the programing. If they had, they can deobligate and reobligate to take care of any borrowing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all as far as the semantics are concerned with respect to resupplying existing programs. We have authorized and appropriated funds on an illustrative basis for programs for the present fiscal year under the regular program. If it becomes necessary, even as a contingency, that it may be required to use some of these funds to finish out the present fiscal year, it would be my purpose in supporting this authorization to be sure that those funds previously authorized and appropriated would not be disturbed or that we would have to modify existing previously approved programs.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I rise only for the purpose of trying to clarify the general situation here. I have not worked with these figures as many Members have. But it is my understanding that this so-called loan or deobligation or whatever it is was made from the Fund for International Organizations and Programs, and that the sum total of that Fund, if I read the correct figure, is \$144 million-plus. I also understand that that Fund involves obligations of the U.S. Government in connection with our contributions to various agencies and that these obligations are fixed.

If that is true—and I am merely rising for information—we would want to put the money back as contemplated in this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To a degree I am asking for information, too. It is my best recollection that the appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 for the international organizations were—and this was a separate amount—100 million-plus—and that that money could not be transferred out of that to help fund to the extent of the full amount.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield further?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand that that \$27.6 million was taken from that specific fund, the entire amount of which is an obligation to the United States. That is my understanding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey because I promised him I would do so, but I would like to proceed with what I started to say on my own time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The debate today indicates what I said earlier, and that is we are being unrealistic if we are suggesting that there is any necessity right now to earmark these particular funds in the way that is being proposed by this amendment. I think we might have less reason to hesitate about earmarking them than we have had. But there is no need for it in this case. We are talking about a 4-month program. That means surely there will be a dislocation of existing programs if we do not have the flexibility which so-called open-ended authorization would provide in this 4-month period. Had we had discussion like this in the committee, we might have come up with a different conclusion. More difficulty would arise if we should now say that these funds can only be allocated in certain amounts as to certain countries.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to complete what I intended to say, and if there is any time remaining, I shall be glad to yield to those desiring me to do so. I understood the statement to be made on the floor that the committee had earmarked funds for a particular country in this bill for the general program and that subsequently we struck that out. I cannot find that language anywhere in this bill. It was not brought up in committee, and there was no amendment to that effect. We did have a country earmarking with respect to administrative expenses and the transferability for that purpose. We put a ceiling and a limitation on those funds, but not on the others. In my judgment, this is no time to talk about changing the whole concept of authorization and appropriation, at a time when it is clear we do not need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 52, noes 71.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GROSS and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Of the funds appropriated under the amendment made by the first section of this act not to exceed \$25 million shall be available for use in the Dominican Republic on a loan basis."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is not to change the amount but simply to see that the amount listed in

the report and hearings for the Dominican Republic should be certain to be on a loan basis. By that I mean the adoption by Congress of a loan rather than a grant policy for capital expenditures on U.S. foreign aid. The question comes up as to how much has the Dominican Republic received from the United States in grants and loans from the time of the revolution. Since the date of the revolution, on April 24, 1965, the United States has made available to the Dominican Republic \$86.3 million until January 10 of 1966.

There is now in the current President's contingency fund \$54.1 million of unobligated funds. As of now, \$37,322,000 of this current contingency fund has been allocated to the Dominican Republic, most of which is for their budget use for the Government. I am not allowed to give you the specific amounts as distributed in the Dominican Republic, although I can hardly see why the information is confidential when the Vietnam listing by category is given and the United States is at war there.

This makes a total already of \$123,622,000 U.S. credits made available to the Dominican Republic since April 24, 1965. That is pretty good financing for a revolution in these short months.

The President now requests for the Dominican Republic another authorization of \$25 million. The question is should Congress make this a grant or a loan by specific designation, or just leave the question open? My position is that these funds should be a loan. The reasons for that position are these: First, they have a low rate of savings and investments in the Dominican Republic. The people are not seriously helping themselves, and we U.S. taxpayers should insist on their doing so.

The second point is that the Dominican Republic has not yet changed their agricultural program to meet present realities and market conditions, so that they vary their Dominican exports. They are still emphasizing sugar heavily and cocoa, which is in excess and overabundant supply at world market prices that are low.

The third point is that the U.S. taxpayers should insist that the Government of the Dominican Republic emphasize the free enterprise system and get out of its many businesses. There are too many businesses in the Dominican Republic that are owned and operated by the Dominican Republic. Too large a part of the businesses are government-owned or operated. My position is: Congress should definitely state the U.S. policy that this \$25 million is a loan. We can make it on a 40-year basis from the U.S. Treasury, the first 10 years at 1 percent interest and the remaining 30 years at 2½ percent interest. The U.S. statutes already authorize that procedure generally.

As to the current Dominican budget and their loans, of June 30, 1965, the Government owes \$30 million to foreign commercial banks on terms of 1 year or less. On a 1-to-8-year basis of maturities, the Dominican Government owes approximately \$153.5 million. If Congress or the administration puts the \$25

million in cash as a grant to the Dominican Republic, all the U.S. taxpayers are doing is picking up the tab for \$25 million of the \$30 million of the loans of the foreign banks which are due on the current under-1-year basis.

How about Dominican foreign loans that have maturities over 1 to 8 years? On those loans there is money owed to the U.S. Treasury, the International Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. On Dominican loans with over 8 years maturity, there is money owing, but that is to U.S. AID, the Inter-American Bank, U.S. Treasury under Public Law 480, section 4, and also the Export-Import Bank. So actually U.S. institutions are owed most of the long-term Dominican obligations. My object is to serve notice to the Dominican people and their Government to get their economic and budget houses in order. Revolutions are expensive.

My question is, Why, when it is stated that this \$25 million is for capital funds in large part, capital budget expenditures, does Congress not specifically label and treat it then as capital investment? Mr. Bell, Director of U.S. AID, stated on page 20 of the hearings, regarding Dominican aid:

Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development, to technical assistance, etc.

Under those circumstances, as this is capital investment, then Congress should specifically treat the \$25 million as a capital loan and lend it on a long-term, 40-year basis.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I wonder what is the reason for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am reading from page 100 of the hearings and from the colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and Mr. Sternfeld, who came up to testify before us:

Mr. FULTON. The question comes whether Congress should not now, at this time, make U.S. supporting assistance on a loan, rather than a grant base, rather than adopt the policy to have loans in the future after these grants.

Mr. STERNFELD. That is our proposition, Mr. FULTON. It is our intention that the \$25 million we are requesting here will be provided to the Government on a loan basis, at this time.

Mr. FULTON. So that there is no more aid going to the Dominican Republic on a grant basis?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. I just cannot understand why the gentleman himself, since he raised this at the hearings, would appear on the floor and offer an amendment to this effect.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Well, the answer to it is this: Unless we in Congress specifically say that this loan policy is the intent of the Congress, I think they will change it and move it around and make it on a grant basis. So I am simply tying this commitment down based upon what the administration said in answer to me, that it will be a loan, and that we in Congress adopt a policy right now of having loans for the Dominican Republic for capital expenditures, and that we say it directly.

So, I am really just outlining the intention of Congress and really outlining the intent of what Mr. Bell says on page 20 when he says:

Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development.

When it is capital development, Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that it should then be on a loan basis.

If this is the specific legislative intent as you state, then I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield further to my good friend and chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. During the hearings it was definitely and specifically stated on three occasions by Mr. Sternfeld, the witness, that this aid to the Dominican Republic would be on a loan basis.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. That makes the legislative intent complete.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out "\$50,000,000" and substituting "\$150,000,000".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will note that by the bill there is added \$100 million as an addition to the President's contingency fund for the current year, that is, the fiscal year expiring on June 30. There are 3 months remaining after the enactment of this bill authorizing this money. So such authorization for the President's contingency fund will be at a rate, if we calculate it annually, of \$400 million, because this present \$100 million increase is only for 90 days. Therefore we are increasing the President's contingency fund at a rate of \$400 million a year.

This is too much undesignated funds by blanket authorization of Congress.

That is too much of a rate of expenditure, without designation or request by the President for Congress approval; my amendment would say to the President, "We will give you \$50 million more in the current fiscal year to spend until June 30, in addition to the \$54 million you already have in your contingency fund."

Mr. Chairman, the President right now has a contingency fund of \$54.1 million; \$4.1 million is the carryover from fiscal year 1965; \$50 million is authorized and allocated already in the 1966 fiscal year in which we are now operating, and which expires on June 30. That has been allocated, I might say, but not obligated. That means it has only been tentatively programed, and can be changed by a bookkeeping entry, alone.

Now, the question comes up: Will Congress increase the contingency fund by \$100 million more? My answer to that question is this: "Mr. President, I think if we give you a contingency fund whereby you can spend \$50 million in the next 90 days after you get this money, until June 30, 1966, that is a very good rate, because it is equivalent to giving you \$200 million for your fund for a year." That is quite a rate of spending by one Government source, without designation or authorization by Congress.

In the 1965 fiscal year the appropriation for the contingency fund was \$99.2 million, and the amount obligated or used was only \$57.2 million. In this fiscal year the authorization is \$50 million and the amount appropriated is \$50 million. But I do believe if the President has contingency funds to the extent that he will have \$100 million that is not obligated between now and June 30 in his special contingency fund to spend as he wants, that is sufficient.

You might say, was this contingency fund in any respect for the military? No; no part of it is for the military.

Second, is any part of it designated? No; no part of it is designated.

Third, are there enough funds for southeast Asia? Yes; the amount presently programed by this bill is \$415 million, of which \$350 million is for southeast Asia, and only \$25 million for the Dominican Republic. We must remember also that this Congress gave the President an extra and special contingency fund of \$89 million specifically for southeast Asia last year for use until the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1966.

So what Congress will be doing is this. My amendment will be adding \$50 million more to the President's present contingency fund of \$54.1 million. So he will have in his pocket, unspent as of this time, to spend between now and June 30, 1966, \$104.1 million. I think if there develops anywhere in the world, a new, unforeseen, and a bigger emergency than that, the administration should come back to the Congress with a specific request for authorization and then Congress would promptly give them the money. My point is that Congress should be consulted.

This contingency fund can be used any place. So if the Congress wants to keep

its authority and wants to keep its hand on the till and wants to be told what these emergencies and contingencies are, then I think we have to make the administration come back here for authorization and study of policies by the committees of Congress who have jurisdiction.

So I recommend that my amendment be adopted giving the President \$50 million for his contingency fund for the 90 days after enactment, to June 30, 1966. My amendment carries the figure of \$100 million because there is \$50 million there now and I increase it \$50 million more so it makes it \$100 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute amendment and if the gentleman from New Jersey will yield so that I may offer my substitute amendment, he can then speak to both amendments.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the floor.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On the first page, strike out line 10 and all that follows down through line 3 on page 2.

And remember the following section accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this. I try always to offer amendments that are easily understood.

This amendment would simply strike out anything for the contingency fund. I offer the amendment for the reason, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said in part, that there was \$50 million for the contingency fund in the regular appropriation bill for this year but not one dime was expended in Vietnam. This bill deals with Vietnam. Moreover, under the terms of this bill the contingency fund, if you vote \$100 million more, can be spent anywhere in the world for anything at any time and at any place. There is nothing in this bill that would prohibit it. It can be used to pay the accounts of the deadbeats in the United Nations, for instance. Why I can think of 100 similar examples of how the money could be used. There is no limit.

There is no reason in the world why we should vote \$100 million to beef up the contingency fund for a period of only 120 days, or until the end of the fiscal year.

How foolish could we possibly be, to vote a \$100 million contingency fund here today in view of the fact that only \$50 million was approved for this entire fiscal year and it was not necessary to spend a dime or a dollar of that amount in Vietnam.

Let reason prevail. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of-

fered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, the reason no money was expended on Vietnam under the contingency this year was that we had a special contingency fund provided under section 451 of \$89 million specifically obligated for Vietnam last year. That has all been used and all of it has been used in Vietnam. The additional \$54 million which was in the contingency fund has already been programmed. There is no money remaining in that fund whatsoever.

If we adopt this amendment, it would be the first time a President of the United States did not have a contingency fund.

In 1956 we had a \$100 million contingency fund.

In 1957 we had a \$100 million contingency fund.

In 1959 there was a \$200 million contingency fund.

In 1960 there was a \$155 million contingency fund.

In 1961 there was a \$250 million contingency fund.

In 1962 there was a \$300 million contingency fund.

These were the authorizations. I might say too that the Congress has language in the act now which states that if the President does not use the money for the purposes outlined or defined as a contingency, it must be returned to the Treasury.

In 1963 when the contingency fund was not completely used, \$127 million was returned to the Treasury.

The fact of the matter is if we adopt this amendment, the President would be without any funds whatsoever to take care of any contingency that might arise in the Dominican Republic or in Vietnam or in any of the dozen flash points throughout the world. This would be the first time that the President of the United States would not be provided with a contingency fund by the Congress. I think that is not the intent of this body. We have never done it before to any President regardless of party, and I do not think we should start now. There is no money in the contingency fund now and I do think we owe it to the President and to ourselves to put this amount in the bill so that the President will have the money to provide for the security of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 2, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and by insert-

ing immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'Funds appropriated under this subsection after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in Vietnam.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if this bill is for the purpose of taking care of Vietnam, then let us take care of Vietnam. Let us not have any shilly-shallying around here. Unless you limit this, the money can be used to pay the dues, as I have said before of the deadbeats in the United Nations. It could be used to underwrite, so far as I know, the million dollars that the U.N. is extracting from American taxpayers to support the Technical College in Havana which is training Communists to carry out subversion and guerrilla warfare in Latin America.

This contingency fund, I say to you again, is wide open to be used in any part of the world at any time. If you mean what you say and say what you mean, adopt this amendment and at least see that the money is used in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This again is a limiting amendment which would tie the President's hands.

The definition of "contingency fund" since 1956, when Eisenhower was President, has limited the contingency fund to unforeseen emergencies. It has never been limited to any country any place in the world. The contingency fund has been available wherever the emergency occurred.

There has never been any limitation on the use of the contingency fund—never. If you are going to handcuff the President we might as well not even vote for this bill.

We are in a war. This money is needed. Let us trust our President with this money. Let us get ahead with our job so that the boys over there can go on with the job of winning this war.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I agree with everything that our Chairman has said. I would like to point out this situation. Suppose North Vietnam decided to send a division of troops into Thailand tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. We might then want some of this contingency fund in order to rush some reinforcement there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I shall give you another example of how the contingency fund today is being used, and that is to finance the boycott of Rhodesia. I cannot help but wonder if we put \$100 million into this fund, if the British decided to use military force in Rhodesia, whether the contingency fund would not be tapped either to finance them in that enterprise or to send American troops over there.

Mr. MORGAN. I have not investigated the situation of Rhodesia. This

measure has nothing to do with Rhodesia. The contingency fund might be used to help the neighbors around Rhodesia, but it has nothing to do with the boycott of Rhodesia.

Mr. GROSS. It could be used to support the British in their boycott of Rhodesia.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In addition to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] pointed out, if there was no money in this contingency fund, we would not have it available to support troops if we had to send them into Thailand.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question has come up as to whether at any time the contingency fund was specifically designated. I would point out that last year in chapter 5, contingency fund, section 451, the following statement appears:

In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in southeast Asia such sums not to exceed \$89 million as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized for parts I and II of this act.

So there has been a designation of a contingency fund by section on the \$89 million bill we passed last year. So why the objection this year?

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly the section I read to the gentleman when I opposed his amendment.

That was an additional sum. If he wants to earmark an additional sum for Vietnam, let us do it. All of that has been explained.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is not the point.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I read that to the gentleman before. This was an additional amount.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The Chairman had said that there was no special designation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to read it again. I have read it twice already. But if the gentleman wants to earmark a sum for Vietnam, let us do it, but let us not limit the President's authority to meet emergencies in other parts of the world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not participated in this debate, and in the pleasant climate of unanimity that seemed to prevail it had been my intention to remain silent, contenting myself with voting for the bill after the shouting was over.

But when my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, brought Rhodesia into the framework of the discussion, implying that there was something evil in our insistence upon equality among the people of that unhappy country, I could not in good conscience, continue to maintain my silence. Virtue, Mr. Chairman, is not something that is up for barter. Morality is not among the wares in the mar-

ketplace. Our position as regards Rhodesia is based upon our national morality and our sense of virtue, and it is certainly not a stance we have taken to please England or anyone else. It is the position that conforms to the still voice of conscience within our own people.

Our virtues and our moralities do not change with the scenery of different parts of the world. What we stand for, and fight for, and for which we give to the utmost in Vietnam, is that for which we stand and fight and give in Rhodesia.

It is the right of self-determination of peoples everywhere, their right themselves to determine by the will of the majority the kind of government under which they will live and the kind of lives they will make for themselves and their children.

I cannot make it too clear that the issue in Rhodesia is essentially the same as the issue in Vietnam. The brutal fact is that in Rhodesia the great majority of the men, women and children, the Africans by race and ancestry, are not permitted the right of suffrage and are denied equality of opportunity. That is a condition we as Americans cannot condone. It has no part in the world of freedom to which we belong and for which we are risking so much in Vietnam and elsewhere.

We are happy that the Government of Great Britain is similarly minded as to Rhodesia, and the right of the majority of the people of that country to control their own destiny. But we are not beholden to Britain, nor Britain to the United States, because our two countries think alike and act with similar response when the virtues and the moralities are in issue.

The United States stands for the right of self-determination in Vietnam and in Rhodesia, and all the world around.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. I give back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAMBERLAIN

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Page 2, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No part of the funds appropriated under the preceding sentence after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be used to provide assistance to any country which permits any ship or aircraft under its registry to transport any equipment, materials, or commodities to or from North Vietnam unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress.'"

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is one which eliminates a glaring loophole in existing legislation. It is my hope that Members of both sides of the aisle will join me in this effort to make clear, beyond doubt, the intent of the Congress to use the economic power of our Nation

in support of the servicemen whom the Nation has sent to the south Asian theater.

This amendment is comprehensive in scope. It denies assistance from the United States to any nation that permits its vessels or aircraft to transport any goods of any kind to North Vietnam. It means simply that the U.S. taxpayer will not be providing support to any nation that is involved in the business of transporting goods to our enemies in this bitter struggle.

Under existing law, foreign aid provided by our taxpayers is withheld from nations whose ships transport strategic goods or items of economic assistance to North Vietnam. The present law is thus restricted to certain types of commodities. It does not prohibit the grant of assistance by the United States to a nation whose ships transport to North Vietnam nonstrategic articles which are sold on ordinary commercial terms.

I think it important that the intent of Congress be made clear by the adoption of this amendment. By its adoption the Congress issues a warning to the other nations of the world that they can expect no further help from the United States unless they cease carrying goods to North Vietnam.

The amendment which I am offering leaves an escape hatch for the President if he cares to use it. The amendment, following the provisions of existing legislation permits the President to waive its prohibition if he determines that withholding of assistance to any country affected by the amendment would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress. To avoid controversy at this time on the question of the latitude which the President should enjoy in the conduct of foreign relations, and after discussions with the distinguished chairman, I include this clause in the text of the amendment.

I recognize that attaching this amendment to this particular bill is in a sense a symbolic act since this measure provides assistance to only a few nations. None of the nations specified in the bill would, to my knowledge, be affected by the prohibition contained in my amendment. The measure, however, does provide a contingency fund, and my amendment could operate to prevent the grant of aid to some nations from this fund. Though the adoption of this amendment may be symbolic, it is important. It is important above all for the Congress to let Americans who are fighting in Vietnam know that they are supported by the full economic power of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely essential that we make the whole world aware of this country's unrelenting determination to bring an end to free world trade with Hanoi. The most recent report of the State Department, all but claiming elimination of this trade, is unfortunately premature. During last month, for instance, the unclassified report I received from the Department of Defense acknowledges that there were seven free world vessels in North Vietnam. But let no one take comfort in this figure for the truth is more than double that. We are,

it would appear, returning to the level of traffic that existed 6 months ago.

We, especially here in Congress, must not let a single opportunity pass that offers the prospect of creating a roadblock for those who would profiteer while others die to safeguard freedom.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, because H.R. 12169 is described as a supplemental foreign assistance authorization, it is most necessary for some of us who have over the years opposed foreign aid to express our views on this bill for the record.

If this were just another broad program of foreign aid I would have no recourse but to oppose such an authorization. The question must be put bluntly, Is this only another worldwide foreign aid program? The report accompanying this bill written by the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs makes it very clear and plain that what is involved here are additional funds primarily for Vietnam, closely related to our war effort there.

As we read the provisions of the bill itself it becomes apparent that to reach the objective stated in the report it must be amended to certain sections of the 1961 act. For the reason that there are no limitations spelled out in the bill earmarking these funds for Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand it would seem that the purpose contained in the report should be included with equal particularity in the bill itself. It is for such reason that I have supported the amendment which circumscribes the great bulk of these funds for Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand and I am hopeful that through some parliamentary procedure, perhaps by a motion to recommit, there may be a record vote that would leave no doubt that these funds are not simply more foreign aid funds but instead special purpose funding for use in the war in southeast Asia.

This morning it was my privilege as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to hear a report from Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY who had returned only last evening from an extended trip to Vietnam, Australia, India, and the Philippines. The Vice President emphasized that the recent Honolulu conference was a turning point because there a determination was reached that we should not only continue to wage the military struggle against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese but at Honolulu we committed ourselves to carry on another war against misery, hunger, illiteracy, poverty, and disease throughout South Vietnam. I came away from this briefing convinced that we have an aggravated problem to deal with in South Vietnam that ranks almost equal in importance to our military effort to stop the Communist aggression.

The funds authorized by this bill are for such worthwhile projects as port expansion, refugee relief, and rural recon-

struction. Who can say these activities are anything but just another face of the war. Along with many others I have opposed foreign aid consistently and repeatedly over the past several years. It is my intention to oppose indiscriminate handouts in the future. It should be clear enough that there is a sharp difference between peacetime economic assistance to the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, on the one hand and special wartime help to Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

One of the differences which immediately rises to the surface of any discussion is the fact that frequently in the past we have left behind a package of aid without adequate administrative personnel to direct or maintain an oversight of its use. On the contrary, in Vietnam and the neighboring countries of Laos and Thailand this present aid will be completely geared or meshed to the military effort. Much of the opposition to foreign aid in so many parts of the world has been based on its maladministration, for many long years. Opposition has been outspoken because military assistance has been contained in the same package with economic aid. It has never made very good sense to me for military assistance to be administered by the State Department rather than by qualified, experienced military personnel. It was good news to learn the President has recommended that in the future no military operations be financed by the Foreign Assistance Act. Notwithstanding this pronouncement for the future, it seems to me we have some good assurance because of the presence of our topflight military commanders in southeast Asia that this special or particular allocation of foreign assistance will in fact be just as much military assistance as if so titled or labeled.

We must remind ourselves anew that it is the presence of our military forces that have created some of the problems of the Vietnamese people. Their government is completely helpless to expand its revenues by taxation, yet they are faced with vital work of repairing war damage to their bridges and highways. They have a huge refugee bill that must be met.

Equally as important as the repair of damage is the counterinsurgency measures such as restoring of farms, and combating disease, in order that the rural population may be given a renewed will to carry on their resistance against the Vietcong.

In Laos there are areas that are now being contested by the Communists and some must be supplied by air. In portions of northeast Thailand the civilian population is being subjected to virtually the same terrorist tactics of murder and assassination as in South Vietnam. Who can argue that funds to strengthen the police units patrolling these besieged northeast Thailand communities is anything but a military effort?

In a word, under the circumstances of the present moment the real justification for H.R. 12169 is embodied in the proposition that if we don't send this \$275 million to Vietnam and the additional \$15 million to Laos and Thailand, then

the remaining alternative is that we are going to have to send more American troops. The choice between our alternatives is made easy.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say that I have followed the gentleman's work on this amendment since early last year. I know he has devoted a great deal of time and study to the ships going to North Vietnam. I have read with interest the last several insertions and speeches he has put in the RECORD on this subject.

I have examined the amendment very carefully, and it conforms with the so-called Castro-Cuban amendment. I think it is a good amendment and, speaking for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we will accept it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Funds made available pursuant to section 1 of this Act shall be available for transfer for expenses authorized by section 637(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 610(b) of such Act, which relates to transfer between accounts, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Not to exceed \$1,400,000 of the funds appropriated under section 402 of this Act after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, may be transferred to and consolidated with appropriations made under section 637 (a) of this Act for such fiscal year, subject to the limitations of subsection (a) of this section and subject to the further limitation that funds so transferred shall be available solely for administrative expenses incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 742, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DERWINSKI moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 12169) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"(c) Immediately after the first sentence, insert the following: 'Funds appropriated under this section after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in the following countries and within the following dollar limitations: Not to exceed \$275,000,000 shall be available solely for use in Vietnam, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Laos, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Thailand, and not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic.'"

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 213, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—169

Abbutt	Cramer	Johnson, Pa.
Abernethy	Cunningham	Jonas
Adair	Curtin	Jones, Mo.
Anderson, Ill.	Curtis	Jones, N.C.
Andrews	Davis, Ga.	Keith
George W.	Davis, Wis.	Kunkel
Andrews	Derwinski	Lalrd
Glenn	Devine	Langen
Andrews	Dickinson	Latta
N. Dak.	Dole	Lennon
Arends	Downing	Lipscomb
Ashmore	Dulski	Long, La.
Ayres	Duncan, Tenn.	McClory
Baring	Dwyer	McCulloch
Bates	Edwards, Ala.	McDade
Battin	Ellsworth	McEwen
Belcher	Erlenborn	McMillan
Bennett	Everett	MacGregor
Berry	Findley	Marsh
Betts	Fino	Martin, Ala.
Bolton	Ford, Gerald R.	Martin, Mass.
Bow	Fulton, Pa.	Martin, Nebr.
Bray	Fuqua	May
Brook	Gettys	Michel
Broomfield	Goodell	Minshall
Brown, Ohio	Gross	Mize
Broyhill, N.C.	Gurney	Moeller
Broyhill, Va.	Hagen, Calif.	Moore
Buchanan	Haley	Morton
Burton, Utah	Hall	Mosher
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho	Murray
Callaway	Harsha	Nelsen
Carter	Henderson	O'Konski
Chamberlain	Herlong	O'Neal, Ga.
Clancy	Horton	Passman
Clawson, Del.	Hosmer	Pelly
Cleveland	Hull	Pike
Collier	Hutchinson	Pirnie
Colmer	Ichord	Poff
Conable	Jarman	Pool
Conte	Jennings	Quile
Corbett	Johnson, Okla.	Quillen

Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schneebell
Schweiker
Secret
Shipley
Shriver

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Beckworth
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clevenger
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Felghan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford
William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Glaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Beckworth
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clevenger
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Felghan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford
William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Glaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan

Ashbrook
Baldwin
Bandstra
Bolling
Bureson
Cusey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clausen,
Don H.
Cohelan
Dague
Dawson

Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stephens
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner

NAYS—213

Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Hollfield
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mallard
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi

Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncallo
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Selden
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Weltner
White, Tex.
Wright
Yates
Young

NOT VOTING—50

Dorn
Dowdy
Dyal
Edwards, La.
Farnsley
Fisher
Grider
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.

Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Wylder
Younger

Saylor
Scott
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.

Toll
Vigorito
Watts
White, Idaho
Willis

Wilson,
Charles H.
Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Senner against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Grider against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Cochran against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Hansen of Iowa against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Mackay against.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia for, with Mr. Miller against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Multer with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Watts.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Farnsley.

Mr. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Dyal.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 350, nays 27, answered "present" 3, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—350

Abernethy	Bray	Daddario
Adair	Brook	Daniels
Adams	Brooks	Davis, Wis.
Addabbo	Broomfield	de la Garza
Albert	Brown, Ohio	Delaney
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, N.C.	Dent
Anderson, Tenn.	Broyhill, Va.	Denton
Andrews	Buchanan	Devine
George W.	Burke	Dingell
Andrews	Burton, Calif.	Dole
Glenn	Burton, Utah	Donohue
Andrews	Byrne, Pa.	Dow
N. Dak.	Byrnes, Wis.	Downing
Annunzio	Cabell	Dulski
Arends	Cahill	Duncan, Oreg.
Ashley	Callan	Duncan, Tenn.
Aspinall	Callaway	Dwyer
Ayres	Cameron	Edmondson
Baring	Celler	Edwards, Ala.
Barrett	Chamberlain	Edwards, Calif.
Bates	Clancy	Ellsworth
Battin	Clark	Erlenborn
Beckworth	Clawson, Del.	Evans, Colo.
Belcher	Cleveland	Everett
Bell	Clevenger	Evins, Tenn.
Bennett	Collier	Fallon
Berry	Conable	Farbstein
Betts	Conte	Farnum
Bingham	Cooley	Fascell
Blatnik	Corbett	Felghan
Boggs	Corman	Findley
Boland	Craley	Fino
Bolton	Cramer	Flood
Bow	Culver	Flynt
Brademas	Cunningham	Fogarty
	Curtin	Foley

Ford, Gerald R.	Long, La.	Resnick
Ford, William D.	Long, Md.	Reuss
Fountain	McCarthy	Rhodes, Ariz.
Fraser	McClary	Rhodes, Pa.
Frelinghuysen	McCulloch	Rivers, Alaska
Friedel	McDade	Rivers, S.C.
Fulton, Pa.	McDowell	Roberts
Fulton, Tenn.	McEwen	Robison
Gallagher	McFall	Rodino
Garmatz	McGrath	Rogers, Colo.
Gathings	McMillan	Rogers, Fla.
Gettys	McVicker	Ronan
Glaimo	Macdonald	Roncallo
Gibbons	MacGregor	Rooney, N.Y.
Gilbert	Machen	Rooney, Pa.
Gilligan	Mackie	Rosenthal
Gonzalez	Madden	Roush
Goodell	Mahon	Roybal
Grabowski	Mailliard	Rumsfeld
Gray	Marsh	Ryan
Green, Oreg.	Martin, Ala.	St Germain
Green, Pa.	Martin, Mass.	St. Onge
Greig	Martin, Nebr.	Scheuer
Griffin	Mathias	Schleser
Griffiths	Matsunaga	Schmidhauser
Grover	May	Schneebell
Hagen, Calif.	Meeds	Schweiker
Halpern	Michel	Secrest
Hamilton	Mills	Selden
Hanley	Minish	Shriver
Hanna	Mink	Sickles
Hansen, Idaho	Minshall	Slkes
Hardy	Moeller	Sisk
Harsha	Monagan	Skubitz
Harvey, Mich.	Moore	Slack
Hathaway	Morgan	Smith, Calif.
Hawkins	Morris	Smith, N.Y.
Hays	Morrison	Springer
Hechler	Morse	Stafford
Helstoski	Morton	Stagers
Henderson	Mosher	Stalbaum
Herlong	Moss	Stanton
Hicks	Multer	Steed
Hollifield	Murphy, Ill.	Stratton
Holland	Murphy, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Horton	Murray	Sullivan
Hosmer	Natcher	Sweeney
Howard	Nedzi	Talcott
Hull	Nelsen	Taylor
Hungate	Nix	Teague, Calif.
Huot	O'Brien	Tenzer
Hutchinson	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Irwin	O'Hara, Mich.	Thompson, Tex.
Jacobs	O'Konski	Thomson, Wis.
Jarman	Olsen, Mont.	Todd
Jennings	Olson, Minn.	Trimble
Joelson	O'Neill, Mass.	Tunney
Johnson, Calif.	Ottinger	Tupper
Johnson, Okla.	Patman	Tuten
Johnson, Pa.	Patten	Udall
Jonas	Pelly	Ullman
Jones, Ala.	Pepper	Utt
Jones, Mo.	Perkins	Van Deerlin
Jones, N.C.	Philbin	Vanik
Karsten	Pickle	Vivian
Karh	Pirnie	Waggonner
Kastenmeier	Poage	Watson
Keith	Poff	Weltner
Kelly	Price	Whalley
Keogh	Pucinski	White, Tex.
King, Calif.	Purcell	Whitener
King, Utah	Quile	Whitten
Kirwan	Quillen	Widnall
Kluczynski	Race	Wilson, Bob
Krebs	Randall	Wolf
Kunkel	Redlin	Wright
Kupferman	Rees	Wyatt
Laird	Reid, Ill.	Wyder
Langen	Reid, N.Y.	Yates
Latta	Reifel	Young
Leggett	Reinecke	Younger
Lipscomb		

NAYS—27

Abbitt	Gurney	Satterfield
Ashmore	Haley	Shipley
Brown, Calif.	Hall	Smith, Va.
Curtis	Ichord	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Tuck
Derwinski	O'Neal, Ga.	Walker, Miss.
Dickinson	Passman	Walker, N. Mex.
Fuqua	Pool	Watkins
Gross	Rogers, Tex.	Williams

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Conyers	Diggs	Powell
---------	-------	--------

NOT VOTING—52

Ashbrook	Carter	Cohelan
Baldwin	Casey	Colmer
Bandstra	Cederberg	Dague
Bolling	Chelf	Dawson
Burleson	Clausen	Dorn
Carey	Don H.	Dowdy

Dyal	Kee	Scott
Edwards, La.	King, N.Y.	Senner
Farnsley	Kornegay	Smith, Iowa
Fisher	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Grider	Mackay	Toll
Gubser	Matthews	Vigorito
Hagan, Ga.	Miller	Watts
Halleck	Mize	White, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa	Moorhead	Willis
Hansen, Wash.	Rostenkowski	Wilson
Harvey, Ind.	Roudebush	Charles H.
Hébert	Saylor	Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Fisher against.
 Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Dowdy against.
 Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Scott against.
 Mr. Dyal for, with Mr. Colmer against.
 Mr. Cederberg for, with Mrs. Roudebush against.
 Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Saylor against.
 Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.
 Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Baldwin.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Mize.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Mackay with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dague.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Teague of Texas.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Kee.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Casey.
 Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Chelf.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Matthews.
 Mr. Grider with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Vigorito.
 Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. ABERNETHY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House to the address by the President of the United States last night on the occasion of receiving the National Freedom Award in New York City. The President delivered one of his greatest speeches, a speech which manifested not only strength but also the resolution of the President of the United States, which is shared by this House and by the people of this country, to the cause of human freedom.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the majority leader for calling to the attention of the House the magnificent address made by the President of the United States last evening in New York. It spells out with great clarity why we are in Vietnam and what our objectives are.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to commend the Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle for the responsible attitude that they have taken as Americans and not as Republicans or Democrats in supporting our Nation's determination to resist naked Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from Louisiana has said, and I associate myself with his remarks. I do not know whether it is as well known as it should be around the country, but I can assert with complete confidence that the House of Representatives and its Members in overwhelming numbers support the policy of the United States in South Vietnam. We have whatever will, whatever determination is required to see the job through to a victorious conclusion. We will not falter. We will not fail.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert with my remarks the text of the President's message in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 24, 1966]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S REMARKS AT THE FREEDOM AWARDS

Twenty-five years ago—to a world darkened by war—President Franklin Roosevelt described the Four Freedoms of mankind: Freedom of speech and expression. Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way.

Freedom from want.

Freedom from fear.

Franklin Roosevelt knew that these freedoms could not be the province of one people alone. He called on his countrymen to assist those who endured the tyrant's bombs and suffered his oppression.

He called for courage—for generosity—for resolution in the face of terror. He said that:

"Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights—or keep them."

Wendell Willkie—Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in the campaign of 1940—shared his belief that freedom could not be founded only on American shores or only for those whose skin is white. "Freedom is an indivisible word," he said. "If we want to enjoy it, and fight for it, we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

That was Republican policy 25 years ago. It was Democratic policy 25 years ago. It is American policy tonight.

How well have we done in our time in making the four freedoms real for our people, and for the people of the world?

Here in America we accord every man the right to worship as he wills. I believe we are more tolerant of religious or sectional differences than we were a quarter of a century ago. The majority of our people believe that a qualified man or woman—of any race—any religion—any section—could hold any office in the land. This was not so clear in 1940.

We are committed, now—however great the trial and tension—to protecting the right of free expression and peaceful dissent. We have learned to despise the witch hunt—the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different. We have gained in tolerance—and I am determined to use the high office I hold to protect and encourage that tolerance.

I do not mean to say that I will remain altogether silent on the critical issues of our day. For just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I believe in the President's freedom to persuade. Let me assure you that I will do everything in my power to defend both.

AMERICAN RECORD

Twenty-five years ago "freedom from want" had the ring of urgency for our people. The unemployment rate stood at 14½ percent. Millions of Americans had spent the last decade in the breadlines or on farms where the winds howled away any chance for a decent life.

Tonight there are still millions whose poverty haunts our conscience. There are still fathers without jobs and children without hope.

Yet for the vast majority of Americans, these are times when the hand of plenty has replaced the grip of want. For the first time in almost 9 years, the unemployment rate has fallen to 4 percent.

This liberation from want—for which we thank God—is a testimony to the enduring vitality of our competitive economy.

It is a testimony also to an enlightened public policy, established by Franklin Roosevelt and strengthened by every administration since his death.

That policy has freed Americans for more hopeful, more productive lives.

It has relieved their fears of growing old—by social security and medicare.

It has inspired them with hope for their children—by aid to elementary and higher education.

It has helped to create economic opportunity—by enlightened fiscal policies.

It has granted to millions, born into hopeless deprivation, the chance of a new start in life—by public works, private incentive, and poverty programs.

For the Negro American, it has opened the door—after centuries of enslavement and discrimination—to the blessings America offers to those willing and able to earn them.

Thus we address the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, 25 years after his message to America and the world, with confidence and with an unflinching determination. We have served his vision of the four freedoms essential to mankind—here in America.

DENIED ELSEWHERE

Yet we know he did not speak only for America. We know that the four freedoms are not secure in America when they are violently denied elsewhere in the world.

We know, too, that it requires more than speeches to resist the international enemies of freedom. We know that men respond to deeds when they are deaf to words. Even the precious word "freedom" may become empty to those without the means to use it.

For what does freedom mean when famine chokes the land; when new millions crowd upon already strained resources; when narrow privilege is entrenched behind law and custom; when all conspires to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?

I do not need to tell you how five administrations have labored to give real meaning to "freedom"—in a world where it is often merely a phrase that conceals oppression and neglect.

Men in this room—men throughout America—have given their skills and treasure to that work. You have warned our people how insatiable is aggression—and how it thrives on human misery.

You have carried the word—that without the sense that they can change the conditions of their lives, nothing can avail the oppressed of this earth—neither good will, nor national sovereignty, nor massive grants of aid from their more fortunate brothers.

You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies will change them.

Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, eager—to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom.

They will be able to look beyond the four essential freedoms:

To the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature.

To the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become, to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease.

To the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being.

This is what our struggle in Vietnam is about. This is what our struggle for equal rights in this country is about.

We seek to create that climate—at home and abroad—where unlettered men can learn, where deprived children can grow, where hopeless millions can be inspired to change the terms of their existence for the better.

THREAT OF TERROR

That climate cannot be created where terror fills the air.

Children cannot learn—men cannot earn their bread—women cannot heal the sick—where the night of violence has blotted out the sun.

Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettos of our own cities, the struggle is the same. It is to end the violence against the human mind and body—so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom won.

We are pitting the resources of the law—of education and training—of our vision and our compassion—against that violence here at home. And we shall end it—in our time.

On the other side of the earth, we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling to be free.

It is about that commitment that I wish to speak now.

Tonight, in Vietnam, more than 200,000 young Americans fight for freedom. Tonight our people are determined that these men shall have whatever help they need and that their cause—which is our cause—shall be sustained.

But in these last days there have been questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, and these questions have been answered loudly and clearly for every citizen to see and hear. The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—and we have no better or stronger tradition than open debate in hours of danger. We believe, with Macaulay, that men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely.

We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What are the questions that are still being asked?

First, some ask if this is a war for unlimited objectives. The answer is plain: It is "No." Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination.

It is to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

Second, some ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling us headlong toward a wider war that no one wants. The answer—again—is "No." We are using that force—and only that force—necessary to stop the aggression. Our fighting men are in Vietnam because tens of thousands of invaders came south before them. Our numbers have increased—because the aggression of others has increased. The high hopes of the aggressor have been dimmed, and the tide of the battle has turned. Our measured use of force must be continued. But this is prudent firmness under careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation.

Third, others ask if our fighting men are to be denied the help they need. The answer is again, and will be, a resounding "No." Our great Military Establishment has moved 200,000 men across 10,000 miles since last spring.

These men have, and will have, what they need to fight the aggressor. They have already performed miracles in combat. The men behind them have worked miracles of supply—building new ports, transporting new equipment, opening new roads.

The American forces of freedom are strong today in South Vietnam. And we will keep them so. They are led by a brilliant and resourceful commander—Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He knows the needs of war and he supports the works of peace. When he asks for more Americans to help the men he has, his requests will be immediately studied, and, as I promised last July, his needs will be met.

Fourth, some ask if our men go alone to Vietnam—if we alone respect our great commitment in the southeast Asia treaty. Still again the answer is "No." We have seven allies in SEATO and five of them are giving vital support, each with his own strength and in his own way, to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Fifth, some ask about the risk of wider war—perhaps against the vast land armies of Red China. And again the answer is "No," never by any act of ours—and not if there is any reason left behind the wild words from Peiping.

We have threatened no one—and we will not.

We seek the end of no regime—and we will not.

Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply. We have measured the strength—and the weakness—of others, and we know our own. We observe in ourselves—and we applaud in others—a careful restraint in action. We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed.

Sixth, men ask if we rely on guns alone. Still again the answer is "No." From our Honolulu meeting, from the clear pledge which joins us with our allies in Saigon, there has emerged a common dedication to the peaceful progress of the people of Vietnam—to schools for their children, to care for their health, to hope and bounty for their land.

The Vice President returned today from his constructive and highly successful visit to Saigon and other capitals, and he tells me that he and Ambassador Lodge have found a new conviction and purpose in South Vietnam—for the battle against want and injustice as well as the battle against aggression.

So the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open—to

help the men of the North when they have the wisdom to be ready.

We Americans must understand how fundamental is the meaning of this second war—the war on want. I talked on my farm last fall with Secretary Freeman, and in my office last week with Secretary Gardner—making, over and over again, the same central point: The breeding ground of war is human misery. If we are not to fight forever in faraway places—in Europe, or the far Pacific, or the jungles of Africa, or the suburbs of Santo Domingo, then we must learn to get at the roots of violence. As a nation we must magnify our struggle against world hunger and illiteracy and disease. We must bring hope to men whose lives now end at two score or less. Without that hope—without progress in this war on want—we will be called to fight again and again, as we must today.

Seventh, men ask who has a right to rule in South Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been here for 200 years: The people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. We will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi: respect for the principle of government by the consent of the governed. We stand for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their result.

Eighth, men ask if we are neglecting any hopeful chance of peace. And the answer is "No." A great servant of peace, Secretary Rusk, has sent the message of peace on every wire and by every hand to every continent. A great pleader for peace, Arthur Goldberg, has worked at home and abroad in this same cause. Their undiscouraged efforts will continue. How much wiser it would have been, how much more compassionate toward its own people, if Hanoi had come to the bargaining table at the close of the year. Then the 7,000 Communist troops who have died in battle since January 1—and the many thousands who have been wounded in that same period—could have lived at peace with their fellow men. Today—as then—Hanoi has the opportunity to end the increasing toll the war is taking on those under its command.

Ninth, Some ask how long we must bear this burden. To that question—in all honesty—I can give no answer tonight. During the Battle of Britain, when that nation stood alone in 1940, Winston Churchill gave no answer to that question. When the forces of freedom were driven from the Philippines, President Roosevelt could not and did not name the date we would return. If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may be long. Our men in battle know and accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much. There is no computer that can tell the hour and day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the steadfast—never to the weak in heart.

Tenth, And finally, men ask if it is worth it. I think you know the answer. It is the answer that Americans have given for a quarter of a century, wherever American strength has been pledged to prevent aggression. The contest in Vietnam is confused and hard, and many of its forms are new. Yet our purpose and policy are unchanged.

Our men in Vietnam are there to keep a promise made 12 years ago. The Southeast Asia Treaty promised—as Secretary John Foster Dulles said for the United States—"that an attack upon the treaty area would occasion a reaction so united, so strong, and so well placed that the aggressor would lose more than it could hope to gain." But we keep more than a specific treaty promise in Vietnam. We keep the faith for freedom.

PRESIDENTS' PLEDGES

Four Presidents have pledged to keep that faith.

The first was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his state of the Union message 25 years ago. He said:

"We are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom."

The second was Harry S. Truman, in 1947, at a historic turning point in the history of guerrilla warfare—and of Greece and Turkey and the United States. These were his words:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

The third was Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his first inaugural address. He promised this:

"Realizing that commonsense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed, all freemen, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

And then 5 years ago, John F. Kennedy, on the cold bright noon of his first day in office, proclaimed:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

This is the American tradition. Built in free discussion, proven on a hundred battlefields, rewarded by a progress at home that has no match in history, it beckons us forward now to the work of peace in Vietnam.

We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy and too young to be tired—too strong for fear and too determined for retreat.

Each evening when I retire, I take up—from a bedside table—reports from the battlefield and from the capitals of the world. They tell me how our men have fared that day in the hills and valleys of Vietnam. They tell me what hope there seems to be that the message of peace will be heard, and this tragic war ended.

I read of individual acts of heroism—of dedicated men and women whose valor matches that of any generation that has gone before. I read of men risking their lives to save others—of men giving their lives for freedom.

Always among these reports are a few letters from the men themselves.

If there is doubt among some here at home about our purposes in Vietnam, I do not find it reflected in these letters. Our soldiers, our marines, our airmen, our sailors, know why they are in Vietnam. They know—as five Presidents have known—how inseparably

bound together are America's freedom and the freedom of her friends in the world.

Tonight I ask each citizen to join me—in the homes and meeting places our men are fighting to keep free from oppression—in a prayer for their safety.

I ask you to join me in a pledge to the cause for which they fight—the cause of human freedom.

I ask you for your help—for your understanding and your commitment—so that this united people may show forth to the world that America has not ended the only struggle worthy of man's unceasing sacrifice—the struggle to be free.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sponsor legislation that would make permanent the school milk program. This act may be cited as the Children's Special Milk Act.

I include myself among that large group of Members of this body who were shocked at the proposed slash of \$82 million in the school milk program.

In the President's budget message of January 24, we were told that "many older and lower priority activities" would have to be reduced or eliminated "in order to finance the costs of our efforts in southeast Asia."

It is obvious that a certain belt-tightening is in order as a result of our grave obligations in southeast Asia.

But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the health and nutrition of our Nation's youngsters, cannot and must not be a matter of lower priority in the wide ranging concerns of our National Government.

I do not intend to belabor my colleagues with a statistical-studded brief on the acceptance and growth of the school milk program, how much true good it has accomplished, and how vital it is to millions of schoolchildren.

However, an eloquent insight to the value of this program can be obtained from the following letter I received from B. T. Smith, administrator of a school district in northern Wisconsin.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Smith's letter at this point in my remarks:

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1,

Winter, Wis., February 17, 1966.

HON. JOHN RACE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RACE: Communications are coming in to me with regard to the possibility of cutting off a good percentage of the funds for Public Law 874, for National Defense Education Act, and for the school milk program. All these programs are of great concern to us here in northern Wisconsin—as I suspect they are in other communities where the income per family is very low.

Our school district for which we are directly concerned is made up largely from low-income families. We have 30 or more children from families living on nontaxable

lands. These families contribute nothing in helping to finance the cost of schools or their municipal governments. Yet their children need and deserve an education—and they need food. Some of these families have insufficient income to provide family necessities.

Much is being done in this, our country to combat poverty—but on the other hand, the young people in our area have been denied work programs. To take away the aid from Public Law 874 means that others in our area will have to provide school lunches for the children of needy parents and they will also have to furnish them with teachers.

The programs I have mentioned above have helped us a great deal but to take them away will hurt not only the children of the area—it will hurt all of us. Our school taxes are up to the limit now so cutting down on the programs, National Defense Education Act, Public Law 874, and the school milk program, will mean a definite problem for us.

If there is a desire to help people who have low incomes, or are impoverished, the programs as they now stand have helped. The other antipoverty programs have not helped us in any way.

Our board of education met last evening and each member was much concerned about the possible legislation to cut the aids mentioned above.

I am sure that you, as Representative, will realize that these losses will affect your areas, too.

I hope that you can find it in your heart to move against any bill to cut these funds.

My best regards to you.

B. T. SMITH,
Administrator.

Yes, I do find it in my heart to move against any bill that would scuttle a program that has proved itself so valuable to children and their families in every State of our Nation.

I think I can say without contradiction that I represent a district which ranks as one of the top three of four districts in this country in milk production. We in the Sixth District of Wisconsin—a district that has more cows than people—are fully aware of the nutritional values of milk and dairy products.

For generation after generation the people of my district have been producing milk products for the Nation. The people of my district have contributed enormously to the health and vitality of all Americans, all too often at the expense of a full share of our national prosperity.

Thousands of Wisconsin dairy farmers have continued to serve the Nation's needs, hoping against hope it seems, that sooner or later the Nation would take them in as equal sharers in our prosperity.

Many thousands of others have been forced to abandon that hope and are now leaving their farms at alarming rates. Now, our National Government seems to be trying to kick them off the farms, at the very time it should be taking drastic measures to halt the bolt.

Has our Government grown so big, and so calloused, and so out-of-touch with reality that we have come to the incredible situation of having some budget bureaucrat, or even computer, sit in an office here in Washington and announce that hereafter little children no longer need milk? That the Nation no longer needs dairy farmers? That bul-

lets and bombs for southeast Asia are more important than the health of our Nation's youngsters?

I pray that such a time and circumstance never occur in this country.

Yes, I represent thousands of dairy farmers.

But I also represent in this Congress of the United States the interests of my Nation and its people.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I serve notice that I will not and cannot go along with a budget bureaucrat's decision to strangle the school milk program.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my bill which would make the school milk program a permanent program, with a funding of \$110 million for fiscal 1957.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Children's Special Milk Act".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage the consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this Act "United States" means the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

SEC. 3. All sums appropriated under this Act, less such amounts as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and necessary for his administrative costs and reserves, shall be allocated at the earliest possible date for the use of nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions desiring to participate in the program and shall be used to reimburse such nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions for fluid milk served to children. Any such allocation, or portion thereof, which the Secretary shall determine will not be fully utilized by any such nonprofit school or other nonprofit institution as then allocated, shall be reallocated by the Secretary so as to accomplish maximum use of such funds.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not less than \$110,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not less than \$115,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each succeeding fiscal year thereafter, not less than \$120,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, under unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, I submit certain communications I have received on the subject of the proposed curtailment of funds for the school milk program:

MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966.

HON. JOHN A. RACE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RACE: We solicit your support for continuance of the special milk program which in fiscal year 1965 was used by 92,005 schools and child care institutions where 2,966,800,000 half pints of milk were consumed. By comparison, 70,132 schools participated in the national school lunch program and used 2,876,150,103 half pints of milk in fiscal 1965.

This usage of milk aggregated nearly 3 billion pounds. Had this milk not been so

used, there can be little doubt that it would have been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the form of nonfat dry milk, butter, and cheese, since approximately 5.7 billion pounds on a milk equivalent basis was actually acquired. The direct cost at the present support price would have been \$103 million, the exact amount Congress appropriated for the special milk program for fiscal 1966. In addition, there would have been the cost of acquiring, handling, packaging, and transporting the products which would have been made from the 3 billion pounds of milk used in the school lunch and school milk programs.

While commercial consumption has shown a gain during the past year and some further gain is expected this year, it now appears that an estimated 3 to 4 billion pounds of milk in the form of nonfat dry milk, butter and cheese will be acquired under the price support program in 1966.

In the light of these circumstances it makes extremely good sense to continue the special milk program. Nearly 22,000 more schools and child care institutions use this program than use the school lunch program. More children are benefited by having a nutritious energy-giving food in the form of milk.

At a time when our Government is spending millions of dollars to rehabilitate school dropouts, is enlarging the food stamp program, and carrying on a war against poverty, it is inconsistent to curtail a program that adds to the health, energy, and vitality of children who are in school and thereby helps them to stay in school. This is especially true with respect to the 22,000 schools and institutions which, because of lack of facilities, funds, or for other reasons do not have a school lunch program.

We of the Milk Industry Foundation, a trade association of milk processors having members doing business in every State of the Nation, including of course your State, respectfully request your help in maintaining the special milk program at a level where all schools and child institutions wishing to participate may do so.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. NORTH,
Executive Director.

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVES,
Madison, Wis., February 11, 1966.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN A. RACE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RACE: The Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives strongly protests the proposed unprecedented 1967 budget cut of \$82 million for the special milk program for schoolchildren. We urge that the special milk program budgets be restored to \$103 million, the current appropriation; preferably funds for this program should be authorized at \$115 million.

The proposed reduction of \$19 million in the school lunch program should also be restored by Congress.

A reduction of the size proposed is tantamount to complete elimination of the special milk program. Complete elimination would divert about 1.5 billion pounds of milk now consumed as fluid milk into manufactured dairy products.

USDA reports indicate the price for milk eligible for fluid consumption was \$4.63 per cwt. in 1965—compared to \$3.33 for milk used for manufacturing. The difference in the two prices is \$1.30 per cwt. The 1.5 billion pounds of milk times \$1.30 per cwt. would mean a loss of \$19.5 million in dairy farmers' purchasing power.

The special milk program is one of our most effective vehicles for insuring good eating habits and at the same time improving

diets of all children. Certainly this important aspect of the program should not be based on ability to pay.

Does the administration realize how much milk consumption in schools will decline if the cost per half-pint is increased? A study in Chicago schools revealed that an increase of 1 cent per half-pint on white milk and chocolate milk reduced consumption by 40 percent. This fact alone should give cause for serious reconsideration of the proposed action.

We urgently request that you do your utmost to combat efforts to reduce the special milk program appropriations. The program, as we know it, has the support of not only dairy farmers but the general public as well. Our younger generation would be dealt a disservice by the U.S. Congress if appropriations for this program are dropped below the current level.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. FARR,
Dairy Economist.

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVES,
Madison, Wis., February 11, 1966.

Congressman JOHN A. RACE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RACE: The Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives directs your attention to the serious situation facing dairy farmers in Wisconsin. Now underway is a serious downturn in the Nation's milk production—resulting from farmers leaving dairying, severe culling of cows and inferior quality feed. The situation could be alleviated by increasing the level of the support price for manufactured grade milk (currently at \$3.24 per cwt. for 3.72 percent butterfat milk). The increase in the support price for milk would be achieved by increasing the purchase prices for butter, cheese, and powder at which the Commodity Credit Corporation would pay for dairy products under the price support program.

U.S. milk production for October 1965 was 2.3 percent under the previous year; November, 3 percent; and December, 4 percent. Total production for this period in 1965 totaled 28.2 billion pounds; the lowest since 1960 when production for the same period was 27.7 billion pounds. If milk deliveries continue at these levels for 1966, total production could approximate 123 billion pounds—down 2.5 billion pounds from 1965. A decline in milk production on U.S. farms of this magnitude would reduce supplies to minimum levels.

Support purchases of dairy products for 1965 accounted for 5.7 billion pounds of milk equivalent—compared to 7.7 billion pounds in 1964. The 1965 figures are the lowest since 1960 when purchases amounted to 3 billion pounds of milk equivalent. If the decline in farm production materializes and commercial demand continues upward, there will not be adequate stocks of dairy products available to meet total demand for products in the fall months. Thus, support purchases would be nonexistent except for the flush (spring) months of production.

Dairy farmers' income would be improved through the increase in support price. Thus, dairy farmers would be in a stronger position to meet the ever rising production costs and the Nation would have ample supplies of milk and dairy products—essential for an adequate diet.

An immediate increase in the support price for milk is vital to the butter-powder industry. Currently, the butter and powder prices are near support levels and the gross return to a dairy plant for 100 pounds of 3.5 percent butterfat milk processed into butter-powder is approximately \$3.68 (59.33 cents times 4.2 pounds butter plus 14.54 cents

times 8.2 pounds powder). However, because of the strong cheese market, Wisconsin butter-powder plants report paying prices from \$3.60 to 3.75 per hundredweight for farm bulk tank manufactured milk. Margins are barely adequate, if adequate, for defraying production costs (labor, depreciation, and supplies). Immediate relief is needed or many persons will suffer financial losses, plants will close, jobs will be lost, and farmers will be without markets.

The current cheddar cheese price is quoted at 41.75 cents per pound for 40-pound blocks—compared to a support price of 36.1 cents per pound. Thus, an upward adjustment in the support price will have no immediate effect on the cheese market, but will improve the financial position of the butter-powder plants.

If the dairy industry develops an export market (commercial and payment in kind) and the Government fulfills its obligation for dairy products in foreign lands, a steady supply is essential.

Supplemental to the price support program is the authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture in section 709 of the 1965 act to purchase dairy products on the open market to fulfill commitments.

We cannot stress strongly enough the urgency of the depressed and chaotic conditions facing dairy farmers, the dairy industry and the economy of Wisconsin. Therefore, your deliberate and forthright action in raising the level of the support price for manufactured milk is solicited.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. FARR,
Dairy Economist.

THE DAIRY COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE,
Brookfield, Wis., February 15, 1966.

HON. JOHN RACE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RACE: America's future rests squarely on the youth of today. To insure a steady growth in a strong, healthy, vigorous America, we must develop a strong, healthy, vigorous group of junior citizens. No other Federal programs have proven themselves like the school lunch and the school milk programs have, in providing the nutrition and proper diet, so necessary to the development of fertile minds and healthy bodies.

The proposed reduction in funds for the school lunch and school milk programs in the national budget, does not appear to be congruous with an increase in the budget for the poverty program and foreign aid. It is false reasoning to deprive schoolchildren of the nutritional benefits of their programs which have no readymade distribution supervision.

We urge you to use every avenue open to you to restore the budget on the school lunch and school milk programs to adequate levels.

Sincerely yours,

THE DAIRY COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE,
EDWIN SCHMIDT, Secretary.

ALLENTON, WIS.,
January 26, 1966.

HON. JOHN A. RACE,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RACE: I am a dairy farmer in the town of Wayne, Washington County, Wis., and I urgently plead with you to make available sufficient funds for the school milk and lunch program. The cut in the budget is surely going to hurt the farmer and is not good for the youngsters in school. Milk is good, pure food. I'm sure it's money well spent.

Sincerely,

PAUL L. SCHMITT.

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE,
Fond du Lac, Wis., January 26, 1966.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In behalf of some 15,000 dairy farmer members of Pure Milk Products Cooperative and hundreds of thousands of other farmers, school systems, children and their parents, this letter is to inform you that there is deep concern everywhere at efforts on the part of the executive branch of our Government to bring about the announced sharp reduction in the school lunch and school milk programs.

We are greatly concerned with the budget proposal which would cut the school milk appropriation for the coming fiscal year to little more than a third of current appropriations and reduce sharply the school lunch funds.

These programs have provided vital contributions to the nourishment of millions of schoolchildren who might otherwise suffer from malnutrition or lack of an adequate and balanced diet. To curtail these important programs, is to shortchange the children of our Nation, and to further encourage a lack of physical fitness on the part of youth of our country. It is inconceivable that we should shortchange our own children under the pretext of a balanced budget, while devoting hundreds of millions of dollars to foreign aid programs.

Not only are these school milk and school lunch programs important in meeting the nutritional needs of our children, they are also important factors in the building of proper diet habits in citizens of the future, and in establishing and maintaining markets present and in the future for the hard-pressed dairy farmers who are the backbone of American agriculture. Reduction of these programs is another slap in the face of this important segment of agriculture. They, the dairy farmers and dairy industry are still dazed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's efforts to drive milk prices downward by the purchase of oleomargarine instead of butter for use in the diets of needy Americans and to fill domestic commitments.

We understand that the Bureau of the Budget has issued a directive to the USDA to withhold several million dollars of the money which Congress had already appropriated for use in the school milk program for the current year. We consider this a serious shortchanging of millions of underprivileged and improperly nourished schoolchildren. In addition, it thwarts the decisions in which Congress took action to provide proper funds for these programs.

We urge immediate action to correct the flagrant departures from the stated objectives of the Great Society program. This can be done by restoring to the programs the funds appropriated by Congress, and by restoring to the budget for the coming fiscal years the money necessary to maintain both the school milk and the school lunch programs at current operating levels.

Sincerely,

WM. C. ECKLES,
General Manager.

VIETNAM

MR. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MR. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, it is the source of no little satisfaction to a Mem-

ber of Congress who supports his President on a matter of national urgency, to know that the people and the responsible press of his district also give the President their support.

On successive days, February 8 and February 9, two of the Nation's great newspapers editorially expressed such support. The two editorials spoke of two vital questions involved:

First, our justification for being in Vietnam, and the attitude of the Vietnamese, and second, the two-dimensional aspects of the conflict.

In its editorial, the Dallas Morning News supported wholeheartedly the President's statement that "were the Communist aggressors to win in Vietnam, they would know they can accomplish through so-called wars of national liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere in the world."

The News went on to say, "South Vietnamese have given the lie to the earlier claims by the peaceniks that their hearts were not in the fight for independence."

The following afternoon, the Dallas Times Herald editorially commented on the President's conference in Hawaii and his statements, adding:

We must work as diligently at easing hardships and improving the peasants' lives as we have at formulating military strategy.

And—

Judging from President Johnson's insistence in Hawaii, the largely one-sided battle will gain this needed second dimension.

I am sure that many of my colleagues would like to read these excellent editorials in their entirety, and I am, therefore, attaching them to these remarks for the RECORD.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Feb. 8, 1966]

THE REASON WHY

The President's speech in welcome to South Vietnam's Premier represented pure Johnson. It was a tough, succinct, hard-hitting speech.

President Johnson used the occasion to blast those "special pleaders" who urge the country to sell out the South Vietnamese and our own troops. He used it to sum up, briefly and well, the reason why the defense of Vietnamese integrity is of critical importance to this country and to the world. The speech he made got the job done.

The South Vietnamese have given the lie to the earlier claims by peaceniks that their hearts were not in the fight for independence. They have continued to fight and die by the thousands in a war that seems to have no limits and no end. They fight, not only as soldiers, but as civil officials and administrators, who go to posts in Red-plagued areas where they are lucky to live for a month. The villagers themselves, whose lot is often harder and more terrifying than that of the soldiers, have continued to resist.

"They fight," the President said, "for the essential rights of human existence—and only the callous or timid can ignore their cause."

Unfortunately, there are some of both in the President's own country and he had some choice words for them:

"There are special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam. They belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope. Were we to follow their

course, how many nations might fall before the aggressor? Where would our treaties be respected, our word honored, our commitment believed?"

Over and over again these special pleaders have asked: "Why are we in Vietnam?"

If the Vietnam critics were listening to the President's speech, they heard the reason explained to them. But it seems doubtful that they were because, as he pointed out, they are deaf to all save the gloomy sounds made by themselves and their kind.

However, the reason that this country has given the lives of more than 1,300 of its young men to defend Vietnam is a valid one, and the President stated it well. He said:

"Were the Communist aggressors to win in Vietnam, they would know they can accomplish through so-called wars of national liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere in the world."

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Feb. 9, 1966]

A TWO-DIMENSIONAL WAR

The degree of mutual understanding apparently achieved between President Johnson and South Vietnamese Premier Ky at their amicable Hawaii conference is encouraging. The two leaders may still differ on emphasis in the anti-Communist war, but fertile areas of agreement also have been found, judging from official statements, for a positive, grass-roots program to aid the Vietnamese people and thereby win their support for the Ky government.

The Saigon leadership still prefers to talk more of escalated military action than about the civilian reforms needed to win the ultimate struggle with the Vietcong at the individual and village level. But Ky and his aids have shown encouraging cooperativeness in Honolulu to President Johnson's insistence that more emphasis be placed on improving the conditions in all areas as they become secured from rebel terror by military conquest. This undertaking will be even more difficult—and less dramatic—than successful combat "search and clear" operations. But realistically, it will be impossible ever to win anything but a tenuous temporary hold on any portion of Vietnam but a handful of cities by military means alone.

This is the paradox of the conflict: It can be lost through military weakness, but it cannot be won purely by military strength. The succession of Saigon governments dominated by military men have too long failed to face this reality of the dual struggle, and so have many American assistance strategists. Now, judging from President Johnson's insistence in Hawaii, the largely one-sided battle will gain this needed second dimension.

There can be no cause for overoptimism about the chances of quick success in the tedious task ahead in the villages. Similar efforts have been made before, with dismal results. But the critical situation demands a new and broader attempt, aimed at building model facilities for giving the backward, war-weary Vietnamese populace every reason to prefer Saigon leadership to Vietcong occupation. Ample American aid and know-how, skillfully applied, could still work wonders.

The United States has helped establish showcases of superior Western culture and living standards elsewhere, as in West Berlin—where the contrast with communism's meager offerings was so painful the Reds had to wall in their people to keep them from flocking to it. Admittedly the job is more difficult in a remote agrarian Asian setting—but so is fighting a war. We must work as diligently at easing hardships and improving the peasants' lives as we have at formulating military strategy. At the technological level, the Vietcong can't compete. We are not making fullest use of the best weapons

we have for winning over the people who are real pawns in this struggle—and keeping them "won."

PROPOSED CODE OF ETHICS FOR CONGRESS

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some hesitation and reluctance to discuss a matter that to me is both unpleasant and embarrassing. Perhaps I am breaking an unwritten rule. But the issue is of such burning importance that I hope I will be forgiven if my words seem out of order or improper in any way.

For the past few weeks I have been shocked to read a series of columns by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson which have made serious charges against the alleged activities of a Member of the other body, and his alleged relationship with Julius Klein, a public relations man, lobbyist, and registered agent for Germany.

What I found particularly painful in these columns was the nature of the charges made. It was not easy for me to read that a Member of the other body stood accused of carrying out assignments for a registered foreign agent in behalf of a foreign government.

In other words, these columns purport to show that a strange and unexplained relationship existed—or still exists—between these two men.

One letter, which I found particularly offensive, was written by a Member of the other body to a member of the German Cabinet. It strongly suggested that Members of the Congress, both Republican and Democrat, endorsed Mr. Klein and habitually seek his advice. I considered this presumptuous statement an insult to me and many of my colleagues, since it presumed to speak for me and was totally untrue.

I found the stories related in these columns so hard to believe, as a matter of fact, that I telephoned Jack Anderson and demanded to see evidence of these charges. Mr. Anderson invited me to his office to inspect his files. I sent a member of my staff to Mr. Anderson's office. He was received cordially and given full cooperation. As a matter of fact, he spent over 3 hours going through Mr. Anderson's files, which consisted of copies of correspondence, telegrams, and memos between the two men, as well as the reports of private investigators. My assistant saw all of the original material quoted in the columns, all of which he told me was unquestionable authentic. He also saw material which has not yet appeared in print, and which he assures me is even stronger and more sensational than what has already been printed in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to judge or condemn other people. But it seems

to me on the basis of what I have seen, and in the absence of refutations or denials by the parties concerned, that these newspaper accounts might indeed be true. And if they are, one cannot avoid speculating on their implications.

The American people have had their faith shaken in the past. Only a few months ago Congress received a very bad press when armies of lobbyists invaded Capitol Hill to get sugar quotas for their clients. And, of course, before that there was the Bobby Baker scandal, which needs no further amplification from me. Over the years, influence peddling and conflicts of interest have always been unwelcome—but hardly unknown—intruders in Washington.

No one questions the right—rather, I should say the absolute duty—of a Congressman to fight for the legitimate interests of his home district and his constituents. That is one of the reasons we are here. But we must all be constantly aware of the dangers of developing too close a relationship with people or companies, and being drawn into the web of opportunity.

These situations, and the suspicion and shame they bring to Congress, emphasize the need for a congressional code of ethics. The nature of the position of a Member of the Congress of the United States gives him virtually unlimited freedom of action. He should not be left completely to his own judgment—because judgment is elastic, and varies between individuals.

Once having established such a code, Congress must enforce it. Why should we wait until a newspaperman or some investigative agency blows the whistle.

It is the responsibility of Congress to draw the line and define the boundaries of proper behavior for its Members. It has shirked this responsibility for too long. According to the present system, Congress avoids scrutinizing its Members' activities too closely. The most flagrant violations of the public trust are overlooked, in strict accordance with traditional "club" rules.

This is wrong. I would like to remind every one of my colleagues that none of us is an innocent bystander. When the mud flies, it gets all of us dirty. We all live in one House, under one roof, and we are judged collectively by the people.

No one questions the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Congress of the United States are dedicated and highly principled people, motivated by the finest instincts. As a matter of fact, the same Jack Anderson devoted a full column last Sunday to a series of short profiles of a number of Congressmen who are scrupulous almost to a fault.

A popular song proclaims, "Happiness is different things to different people." I submit that ethical behavior is in the same category. With Congress setting a standard—and enforcing it with determination—all of us will feel a little more comfortable knowing that we must all measure up to the very same standard of proper behavior.

I firmly believe that the time of decision has arrived for us to look deeply inside ourselves, individually and as a body. Past and recent events have made

it clear that one Congressman's ethical standard may not be quite exactly the same as another's. And so, for the protection of both of them, and for the Nation as a whole, I urgently request at this time that Congress give priority attention to the establishment of a code of ethical behavior for the guidance of its Members.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, while the battle for freedom continues in Vietnam, the United States and the Government of South Vietnam are making serious efforts to improve conditions in the hamlets and villages. Too often, however, the good we have done—and are doing—in the field of community development is obscured by the smoke of the battle-field.

It is about time we told the world more about the less visible war in South Vietnam.

The Agency for International Development provides cement, steel, building materials, equipment, food, books, and other needed materials. But just as important, it provides people—American specialists in community building. They go there of their own volition; they are staying of their own volition. Usually, the Vietcong leave the AID technicians alone. They know that the villagers are ready and willing to protect their American friends and the things they have built together.

Few Americans can realize what it means to a village to receive help in digging a well or making a more efficient windmill. Few Americans know what it means to have the rice harvest doubled. Few Americans can know what fish from a newly stocked pond can mean to a Vietnamese family's diet.

Yes, AID is helping Vietnam's villagers build things a man will fight for. At the end of 1964, over 8,000 self-help projects had been completed and another 6,000 were underway. In the first half of fiscal 1965 alone, some 1,600 self-help projects had been approved and 500 completed, projects involving more than 80 different activities including construction of public meeting places, rice and fish drying platforms, classrooms, bridges, privies, road and bridge repair.

The natural tendency is to think of community development programs in statistical terms but the real success of the program cannot be so measured. Its true value lies in the fact that by working together the people develop a community spirit.

Participation in the selection and management of the project is spirited, the projects are often a source of pride, and the villagers begin to have a stake in their own future. Such involvement and identification can be a key factor in defeating the Vietcong.

Community development programs, encouraged and supported by AID, are proving every day that freedom can deliver what communism can only promise.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the dedication of our AID employees in Vietnam and I call for quick approval of this request to enable them to continue their fine work.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, Estonians everywhere celebrate a landmark in the rich history of their homeland. On that day in 1918, 48 years ago, the executive committee of the National Council of Estonia proudly proclaimed to the world that henceforth the Republic of Estonia would stand in the ranks of the free nations of the world.

The road to independence had been a long one for the brave people of Estonia, filled with bitterness, death, and anguish. After the prize had been won, Estonians were forced to take up arms once more to defend their freedom. Bolsheviks tried to establish their rule and push Estonia back into Russian tyranny. German volunteers, who aimed at reestablishing German supremacy, also had to be expelled. Finally, in 1920, Russia signed a peace treaty with Estonia in which she "voluntarily and forever" renounced all claims to the territory and people of Estonia. The young republic was now free to settle down to an era of economic productivity and progressive government.

Independence for Estonia ushered in a period of significant achievement in all phases of national life. Once independence had been won, Estonians plunged fearlessly into tasks of economic, political, and social reform. The new government immediately took over the large estates owned mostly by the nobility and distributed them to the men who had fought so bravely for independence and to many others who had never known the joy of owning their own land. As a result of the land reform program, agricultural production expanded tremendously.

On the political and social fronts, great progress was also made. A democratic constitution was adopted. Legislation was passed, requiring all children between the ages of 7 and 14 to attend school. Nearly all citizens learned to read and write. Schools were built at an impressive rate. Estonia supported professional and technical schools that trained lawyers, doctors, dentists, engineers, artists, and musicians. An 8-hour day was introduced.

Music, art, and cultural pursuits of all kinds flourished as Estonians enjoyed the blessing of freedom without fear of government reprisal. The number and scope of newspapers grew considerably.

In 1939 Estonia boasted 15 daily newspapers. Freedom of religion was complete, and the various religious denominations were able to conduct their affairs as they chose.

For 22 years the noble Estonian people worked to establish a strong and independent state, only to witness sorrowfully the end of independence with the coming of the terrible Second World War. In 1940, the Russians brutally occupied Estonia and staged fake elections, which made Estonia a part of the Soviet Union. In the first 12 months of Soviet occupation more than 60,000 Estonians of all ages and classes, or about 5 percent of her total population, were either killed or deported. On the night of June 13-14, 1941, alone, more than 10,000 were removed from their homeland forever.

German rule supplanted Russian domination from 1941 until 1944, when the Soviet Union again tyrannized the little land. With the return of Russian rule, numerous arrests were made, many Estonians were put to death, and thousands were deported to Russian labor camps. Peasant farms which had been so proudly and carefully tended, were brought into collectives. Industries were nationalized. Religion was discouraged. Education was changed to conform to Russian ideas. Russians replaced the majority of Estonians in places of authority in the Government. Estonians were again subjected to the horror and indignity of deportation. In 1945 and 1946 about 20,000 Estonians were deported. The third large deportation occurred in 1949 when about 40,000 persons, mostly farmers who had resisted collectivization, were wrenched forever from their homes and families.

Estonians have suffered greatly under Russian tyranny. Yet through all the long years of hardship and oppression the people of Estonia have carefully preserved their own language, ancient folklore, way of life, and their indomitable will to be free. They have never relinquished the fervent hope that someday their freedom will be restored.

We who enjoy the blessings of liberty reaffirm on this glorious Estonian independence day that we will never cease our efforts to bring freedom to all men everywhere. We thus observe today both a glorious event in the life of Estonia and a renewal of our own sense of duty toward all captive peoples. With this in mind, it is a happy privilege for me to extend warmest best wishes to my many friends of Estonian descent in my own Ninth District of Massachusetts, in the United States, and throughout the world on their independence day.

Congratulations to a great people.

WATER MANAGEMENT—ITS MEANING

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a very frank and elucidating discussion on water management was presented to the National Water Conference in Washington last December 9, by John E. Kinney, a sanitary engineering consultant from Ann Arbor, Mich. It merits wide circulation, particularly among Federal, State, and local government officials.

Mr. Kinney is convinced, and I think properly so, that lack of understanding and professional competency—in company with bureaucratic ambition—are preventing or at least delaying development of solutions to our water problems. He contends that the water famine is more a famine in knowledge and ideas than in water.

Candid criticism of this nature is refreshing and instructive. While voicing his objections to the overall approaches to water problems, Mr. Kinney is quick to cite instances where proper leadership is accomplishing sound water management. He credits the Ohio River Sanitation Commission for its progress in pollution control, and Governor Rockefeller is commended for his New York State program because "he substituted facts for platitudes, understanding for regulations, and technical assistance for public indictments."

If, as it now appears, industry and the general public are going to give the Rockefeller program the support and cooperation that it merits, New York's discouraging outlook for water supply will be reversed in a relatively short time. The ORSANCO record is a case history in effective pollution reduction.

When eight States joined in 1948 to form a compact—ORSANCO—approved by Congress to pool their resources and police powers for control of interstate water pollution on the Ohio and its tributaries, more than 99 percent of the population along the thousand miles of river discharged raw sewage and a variety of industries poured volumes of dregs and waste into the once-clear waters. Today treatment plants are in operation or under construction for 94 percent of the valley's sewage, and 90 percent of the 1,730 industrial plants along the waterways have installed facilities that meet ORSANCO's basic-control requirements.

ORSANCO has come a long way, but its members will not be satisfied with a job that is only partly finished. There can never be a letup along a waterway where population continues to rise and more and more generating, processing, and manufacturing plants are located. The major lesson to be learned from ORSANCO is that it was not formulated upon the selfish interests of a single community or State, nor was it conceived in an atmosphere of panic that emphasizes immediate needs without thought of long-range planning. The attack on Lake Erie pollution has been slow in coming, but the program now underway will be successful if all the affected States—and Canadian Provinces as well—join together in the same spirit and with the same vigor that has been the history of ORSANCO.

America can lick the water problem, but it is going to take a heap of under-

standing, determination, and money. Pollution abatement alone is not enough. Water must be used efficiently, recycling of industrial water for reuse is an important factor; and converting brackish and ocean waters to fresh water is mandatory. There are still dams and reservoirs to be built, but, as Mr. Kinney points out, their desirability and serviceability must be determined by accurate statistics and not by political expediency.

Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I should like to have the Kinney address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

WATER MANAGEMENT—ITS MEANING

(By John E. Kinney)

The Peanuts comic strip by Schulz provides a course in psychology and a means of assessing the forces in water management. If you follow Charlie Brown's daily entanglements with human nature, the observation that viewpoint makes the difference will adequately explain why we have platitudes on water management but no common understanding as to its meaning.

Those who appraise the tactics of Lucy, his principal adversary, have an intimate understanding of why the importance of water management is not sufficient justification for a common resolution of its meaning.

When Charlie Brown attempts to rationalize some action or hope, he soon learns he stands alone. If he attempts to convince Lucy, the results can be nearly fatal. Her classic remark, after bowling him over—"I had to hit him. He was beginning to make sense"—offers the essence of the rationale and reaction by many who have issued ultimatums based on preconceived ideas or desires.

If Charlie Brown attempts to seek support from Linus, there is promise but no action. Linus, the epitome of insecurity, can be easily dissuaded by Lucy with an admonition such as: "Don't burn all your bridges behind you."

Enlisting the support of Sally or Violet is even more hopeless. The cause may be serious but it can't, in any measure, match the importance of hair styling, clothes or any other item of similar personal concern. And Schroeder, his life is dedicated to Beethoven.

Even Snoopy, the dog, lets Charlie know there is a responsibility for the master to feed the subject but this responsibility should not be confused with any assumed authority to command respect or action.

Our protagonists in water management can be categorized into these counterparts in the Peanuts comic strip. The word protagonist is used advisedly. The heat of dissonance, the incompatibility of objectives and the stridently voiced demands support no other.

SCOPES OF MANAGEMENT

The trend continues to let today's expediency control rather than anticipate tomorrow's needs. For example, the glamour of the big dam with the scenery of the lake it creates is more appealing than the importance of the land flooded or the availability of water from below the surface of the earth.

Yet there is a reserve in water supply not far below land surface which, according to Geological Survey estimates, is some 34 times the annual runoff of all the rivers in the Nation. There is probably an equal volume in deep ground storage. Our underground water supplies exceed in volume those in our lakes and reservoirs. This should be a sobering and reassuring factor but it gets little attention. Rather than manage surface and underground waters jointly, we rely on one or the other. Our much-publicized

water famine is more a famine in knowledge and ideas than in water.

The limitations in adequately defining water management are evident in other actions. In some areas transfer of water from one drainage basin to another is not acceptable, even when it could pay long-term benefits. Other areas rely solely on imported water and, under one pretext or another, make no effort to utilize or reuse waters within the area.

And if that is not sufficient cause for confusion, some believe that treating waste waters so as to make them as clean as possible will solve our dilemmas. Others, meanwhile, with more understanding, are arguing for a classification of waters, just as land use is classified. These persons argue that all uses should be provided for in every area but not necessarily all in the same water.

There are also controversies over present and future uses. The present economic importance of the water resource to our way of life can be argued as all important, or lightly dismissed with the nebulous inanity that water is so important to our future continued existence, economics cannot be a limiting consideration.

Through all this three things are apparent: 1. Water development (so-called water management) in this country has been characterized by short-term solutions without the knowledge, understanding, or data which would allow decisions to be made with more logic and a better insight into the results of choices open to us.

2. The details can be all important. The picture of a sewer outfall or a low reservoir is more important than the corrective program underway.

3. Specific areas of self-interest have nurtured a public concept of perennial water shortages and gross pollution. This is being exploited for political vote-getting purposes. It has also led to a tendency for some in high positions in Government to grasp for authority and funds, not for purposes of protection of society, but for organizational and professional power and aggrandizement of self or agency.

PERSONAL MEANING OF MANAGEMENT

Going back to the Peanuts comic strip provides a method to depict a very large segment of the public. Represented by Linus, they consider water adequately managed as long as they reap the benefits and do not feel the fury. For most this means no flood damage, and, more importantly, when they turn on the faucet the water flows clean and safe to drink.

Their thoughts encompass no more than that until they read articles on droughts or on polluted beaches. At such times the negative controls; they perceive the lack of management.

For these people the only remedy necessary is a dam, a strong law, or a Federal subsidy. But whatever remedy is adopted, it must be now.

Real panic sets in if this soul of insecurity should be told that the water may stop flowing from his faucet by the year 2010, or that the lakes are dying. To forestall such horrendous possibilities, he will gladly endorse any project advertised as a guaranteed solution. This endorsement doesn't require a check on the accuracy or immediacy of the crisis. Nor does it await any independent, technically competent evaluation of the real value of the proposed cure.

"Dying Lake Erie" has excited many wakes. The disturbed individuals attending the demise of this body of water have neglected to learn that the best-educated estimates of the actual time of the death is some 10,000 years from now. The more immediate problems of education, slums, and delinquency are either of less importance or too much of a challenge for those who emotionally demand action now to save Lake Erie.

In an emotional pitch before the "United Action for Clear Water" conference called by the United Auto Workers in Detroit on November 6, a representative from HEW told the union members that the lifeblood of jobs in the steel, chemical and paper industries is water; that Lake Erie is rapidly dying—"filling in with algae and solids"—and with its death there goes their jobs. The fear of loss of jobs with loss of income is real. The threat worked. The audience wanted action to force the industries to stop polluting the water now—to stop destroying the lake which is providing the water for their jobs. One wonders why the industries don't appreciate that pollution will close down their mills.

I have yet to hear any audience discussing juvenile delinquency, attacks on women, or substandard education reach the emotional pitch generated at meetings demanding action to save Lake Erie. Our sense of values at times is most questionable.

AN EXAMPLE OF ACTION

If you were to investigate your home area activities carried on under the guise of water management, the confusion of agencies involved would be a revelation. The blinders worn by those promoting progress at any cost might not be readily apparent but with time would be evident.

As an example, consider the proposal now underway to place a reservoir on a creek upstream from Ann Arbor, Mich., in the Huron River basin. This reservoir is touted to the public as providing flood control, low flow augmentation, water supply, recreation and habitat for fish and wildlife. Since everyone is promised a benefit, the public appeal is terrific.

Ann Arbor's future water needs could be supplied by simply connecting to the Metropolitan Detroit authority, but developing further surface supplies seemed more desirable to some. To get a study at no cost as well as a vehicle to invite Federal funds for construction, the assistance of the Corps of Engineers was solicited by a basin promoting committee.

Since the Corps is limited to projects which have flood control benefits, some justification had to be devised. If the lower river channel is not widened as much as planned, and if the optimistic population forecasts are accurate for the year 2000, then it was estimated that a possible flood damage of \$145,000 a year might then be realized in the lower river. The door was opened for a "free" study.

Ann Arbor has secondary treatment of sewage. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report estimated a need of four times their reported present low flow in the river by the year 2015 to provide high dissolved oxygen downstream from the treatment plant.

However, it seems HEW used data considered in error and the low flow is now said to be three times that reported. The Corps of Engineers is assuming no responsibility for determining the accuracy of measurements. So far HEW has not agreed to revise its report. The flow augmentation benefits are as subject to criticism as are the flood benefits.

Only one of six possible sites has been promoted. The site covers some 14,000 acres of the most fertile agricultural land in the basin. The natural flatness of the land will result in only 1,500 acres with water more than 9 feet deep. Over 6,000 acres will have less than 2 feet of water.

Some of the less desirable features are glossed over. Because this creek drains fertile farmland, the algae now in farm ponds will bloom in abundance in the shallow water. As the water level drops the algae will die and the city water supply can expect continuous taste and odor problems, such as it now experiences in spring and

fall. The mudflats will provide excellent mosquito breeding.

Of greater significance, however, is the limitation on the Corps of Engineers which orients all considerations toward flood control benefits. This bias does not allow a total and impartial assessment of the area's economic and social needs.

Regardless of the term "multipurpose," incompatible purposes such as low flow augmentation and recreation cannot be best served by the same reservoir. In a given area several single-purpose reservoirs could be vastly more effective. Yet, the Corps of Engineers mission denies this possibility. And, in addition, the value of land as a resource must be considered as of comparable significance in satisfying future area needs. Evaluating land in terms of today's markets, and water in terms of value 100 years hence, is less than reasonable.

Objection by the farmers to the loss of their land is considered as selfish by many concerned solely with the dire forecasts of future water shortages. However, we cannot continue to dismiss alternatives to basin needs simply because groups employ the tactics of Lucy and either dominate decision or destroy objection by scornful comment.

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF WATER MANAGEMENT?

At present there are platitudes and sound scientific generalizations espoused by professional and student. But, among the public, water management is simply defined by each person as satisfying or promising to satisfy his personal wants. So long as there is the promise, there is no demand to ascertain facts or evaluate projections on alternatives. Education has provided tools for enhancing our scale of living but it has failed miserably in enhancing the ability of the individual to think objectively.

If Charlie Brown were to look at the history of the ancients who used water in expertly designed structures but perished because they did not use water and land wisely, and if Charlie were then to study in detail the manner in which we Americans are also building expertly designed structures but not using our water and land wisely, his conclusion undoubtedly would be that, regardless of how sincere or how well intentioned unbridled enthusiasm may be, it is no substitute for competency. Charlie would express it quite simply: "Good grief."

WHAT IS NEEDED FOR WATER MANAGEMENT

Our ever-increasing pandemonium continues because we lack competent leadership and argue over ill-defined goals. This situation could be corrected:

If the principal task of scientific water resources investigations is kept separate from the equally important functions of law enforcement, regulation, and capital construction;

If the executive branch of the Government accepts the responsibility of establishing a more reasonable balance in the budget among the various needs for research, investigation, and construction;

If the Bureau of the Budget would learn how the costly "comprehensive planning" by HEW and the Corps of Engineers is being deliberately bypassed by HEW in order to establish precedent and authority, under the guise of pollution control, before the comprehensive surveys are concluded;

If the technically competent assert professional status by assuming responsibility for recommendations in difficult decisions; and

If political and technical leaders define specific goals and guidelines rather than continue the fallacy that a continuing progression of ever-stronger laws with increased appropriations can substitute for competency.

Leadership in accomplishing water management is possible. ORSANCO (the Ohio

River Valley Water Sanitation Commission) has shown how the pollution control aspects can be attained. And now Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has taken the cry out of crisis in New York State. In lieu of denunciation of deplorable conditions, he directed attention to specific goals. He outlined a 6-year program to cost \$1 billion, and the people bought it. Governor Rockefeller substituted facts for platitudes, understanding for regulations, and technical assistance for public indictments. While he promised to attempt to get Federal moneys, he induced the people to use their own money and get started.

History will separate the leaders from the haranguers. The means is simple and has stood the test of time. Fanciful inventions and distortions of fact, whether deliberate or not, give glory which is soon exhausted "for the mind can repose only on the stability of truth."

And that goes for management of water, too. We need less "Good grief" and more "Let's play ball." We need fewer Lucys and more Charlie Browns.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader what is the program for the remainder of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman, this concludes our legislative business for this week, and it will be our purpose, after announcement of the program, to ask to go over to next week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are no bills. But Monday is being set aside for eulogies for our late beloved colleague, Albert Thomas, of Texas.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day, and there will be considered H.R. 12889, the supplemental defense authorization bill, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate, waiving points of order.

For Wednesday and the remainder of the week there will be considered:

S. 1666, to provide for additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 9963, the Alaska Centennial of 1967, under an open rule, with 2 hours of debate.

H.R. 12322, the Cotton Research and Promotion Act.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House

adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of Members of the House today to the 48th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. Unfortunately, the brave people of Estonia are now among the captive peoples of communism, and this great day in their history cannot be celebrated in their homeland because of the tyranny of their Red rulers.

We must rededicate ourselves, therefore, on this great historic day for the Estonians, to continued efforts to see that freedom is restored to these proud people and all the other captives of communism.

The Estonians proclaimed their independence after the tsarist government fell and from 1918 until 1940, when their country fell to the Communist forces, they enjoyed a period of freedom and progress.

We must not only commemorate historic national days such as Estonian Independence Day, Mr. Speaker, but we must take practical steps to indicate our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism. One such practical move would be the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, an action which I have repeatedly urged the House to take.

I also think the Voice of America should provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Estonia. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast in the Estonian language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives straight news only and is fearful of offending the Soviet Union under the policy of the present administration. I believe the Estonian people deserve the truth, and the Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering it to them to

counteract the brainwashing of constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, last night I attended a dinner at the Washington Hilton Hotel commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946. In our Capital City of Washington, D.C., unemployment of unskilled persons is as high as any other place in the United States. Welfare costs are enormous in Washington, D.C.

Nevertheless, every single waiter and busboy who served the guests at this celebration of the Employment Act was imported from Europe. Each imported worker takes a good job from some unemployed U.S. citizen.

Each waiter last night was recruited by the hotel from throughout Europe. Each waiter last night was cleared by the Department of Labor under Public Law 414.

We heard messages from three Presidents telling how great and effective the Employment Act has been. President Johnson reported how good the employment conditions are in the United States today—but he did not mention the hotel and restaurant industry in our large cities.

Where is the Federal Government, where are the District officials, where are the labor unions, where are the poverty workers who sit by idly and unconcernedly, permitting thousands of workers from Europe to be imported to work in hotels and restaurants in Washington, and other U.S. cities, taking jobs from U.S. citizens who are unemployed, and on the welfare and relief rolls.

Cannot our local unemployed citizens be trained for these jobs more effectively, and more profitably, than recruiting and importing foreign workers?

This incongruous situation may be too practical and mundane for consideration in the intellectual atmosphere of the symposium held in conjunction with the 20th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946.

But how can governmental officials, labor union bosses, and unemployed workers continuously ignore the importation of one kind of labor force—and permit able-bodied U.S. citizens to remain and to atrophy on the welfare rolls?

Perhaps the hotel industry in Washington, D.C., cannot afford to pay wages high enough to attract a domestic labor force. Perhaps the hotel industry cannot afford losses. Perhaps labor union officials in the hotel industry lack the courage of the labor union officials working in the agricultural industry. Perhaps the Department of Labor is more interested in the hotel industry than in the

agricultural industry. Perhaps the poverty program cannot train hotel and restaurant workers.

Also, Mr. Speaker, how can we permit the permanent importation of foreign hotel and restaurant workers when many unemployed U.S. workers eagerly seek these good and desirable jobs and, at the same time, deny growers of vegetable row crops any opportunity to import workers even temporarily to avoid crop losses at peak harvest times when few domestic workers desire farmwork at all?

I would like an explanation of this seeming paradox—from the Department of Labor, the administration, a labor union official, or from the Washington, D.C., Welfare Department. I suspect that any factual explanation would be embarrassing to every group and agency involved. I do not, therefore, expect an explanation. But refusal to explain does not make the situation correct or tolerable.

BIG GOVERNMENT—FRIEND OR FOE?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, at Stanford University, delivered an address on January 9 before the San Diego Open Forum, entitled "Big Government—Friend or Foe?"

Mr. Freeman has developed some very thought-provoking suggestions which I am sure will be of interest to all of the readers of the RECORD interested in Government.

His address follows:

BIG GOVERNMENT—FRIEND OR FOE?

(By Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member, the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, San Diego Open Forum, January 9, 1966)

"DAS LIED VON DER GLOCKE"

"Wohltaetig ist des Feuer's Macht
Wenn sie der Mensch bezahmt, bewacht,
Und was er bildet, was er schafft,
Das dankt er dieser Himmelskraft;
Doch furchtbar wird die Himmelskraft
Wenn sie der Fessel sich entrafft,
Einhertritt auf der eignen Spur,
Die freie Tochter der Natur.
Wehe, wenn sie losgelassen.

—"FRIEDRICH VON SCHILLER."

[Translation]

"THE SONG OF THE BELL"

"Beneficent the might of flame,
When 'tis by man watch'd o'er, made tame;
For to this heav'nly power he owes
All his creative genius knows;
Yet terrible that power will be,
When from its fetters it breaks free,
Treads its own path with passion wild,
As nature's free and reckless child.
Woe, if it casts off its chains."

In the year 1965 the American people enjoyed—more or less—\$675 billion economy and a \$210 billion government. While all

Americans, from right to left, like a steady and rapid increase in national income and product, they are less than unanimous in their feelings about the expansion of government. Some believe that government has grown too fast, become too big, and should be cut down to size. Others are just as convinced that government is not doing nearly all it ought to, that it is being starved and should be enlarged. A third group's argument is not so much with the size of government itself but with what it does and how it does it. So, it seems to come down largely to a question of what government should be doing—or leave alone.

Governments, the Declaration of Independence proclaims, are instituted among men to secure certain unalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It goes on to say that whenever government becomes destructive of those ends, the people have the right to alter or abolish it.

Nobody—or almost nobody—has argued that government in the United States has become so destructive that it ought to be abolished. But many observers are critical of the course set by government and would alter its direction if they could. Some question defense and foreign policies and hold that our national security, present and future, is in jeopardy, that it is less well protected from potential aggression than it need be or should be.

Others contend that government's domestic activities have not helped to secure and widen the liberty and pursuit of happiness of its citizens. Government, they say, is of course doing many things without which a civilized society could not exist. But its tendency to extend the range and intensity of its functions and to penetrate deeply into affairs which used to be regarded as being in the private sphere, narrows and endangers individual freedom. That, they hold, is the very nature of government. "Liberty has never come from the government," Woodrow Wilson wrote, reminding us that "the history of liberty is the history of limitations on governmental powers, not the increase of it."

Thomas Jefferson, in his later years, looking back over the experiences of his long life, concluded that "the natural progress is for liberty to yield and for government to gain ground." Just 15 years ago a freshman Massachusetts Congressman wrote:

"The scarlet thread running through the thoughts and actions of people all over the world is the delegation of great problems to the all-absorbing Leviathan—the state. . . . Every time that we try to lift a problem to the government we are sacrificing the liberties of the people."

That young Congressman's name was John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Throughout recorded history men who fought for liberty fought against a government. At times, of course, they warred against a foreign ruler. But more often they battled a domestic government they deemed to be tyrannical. The observance of democratic procedures, many Americans believe, assures us of the preservation of liberty and eliminates any possibility of tyranny. But the holding of elections, even if honest and free, does not protect a minority against oppression by a majority. Nor does it safeguard a majority against a chief executive who commands the power and skill to bend or beat legislators, communities, local officials, civic, and business leaders into submission. All member countries of the United Nations maintain some symbols of democracy although in many or most of them the people have little power over the conduct of their government.

When a government tightens the rules under which its residents must live and limits their freedom of action, it always does so in the name of the people and for their pre-

sumed benefit. It may retain established rituals and honored traditions by which it stakes out a seemingly respectable claim to legitimacy. Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin claimed to be governing in the long-range interest and for the good of their citizens, many of whom (and at times a majority of whom) believed, at least temporarily, that it was all done for their own "liberty and pursuit of happiness." Almost 40 years ago Mr. Justice Brandeis, one of the leading liberals of his day, warned:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding (*Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 478).

If we define freedom as the ability of the individual to make meaningful choices between known alternatives, then it follows that the extent of his freedom depends on the range of decisions which he can make for himself and his family or which are being made for him. The larger a share of his product or resources government takes from him and spends for him, the less he can allocate to his manifold needs and wants—for housing, education, health, support of aged parents, etc.—according to his own judgment, desire or preference. Even if his freedom of action is not explicitly circumscribed, the economic penalty for exercising it—such as preferring a nongovernmental to a governmental "free" service—becomes prohibitive. And as a central government enforces uniformity in all local areas throughout its realm, it destroys its citizens' freedom of choice.

This seems to suggest that the basic issue is the size of taxing and public spending and that the extent of individual liberty can be measured by the percentage of the national income or product which is channeled through government. An often repeated definition of the difference between a liberal and a conservative is that the liberal wants government to spend more and the conservative wants it to spend less.¹ There is just enough truth in this oversimplification to make it plausible and widely accepted. But it misses some crucial points and does not aid understanding.

Conservatives and liberals alike recognize that in the second half of the 20th century the government of an industrial nation, and a world leader at that, must be big government. What divides liberals and conservatives is not so much their views on the necessary or desirable magnitude of public spending as a conflict on the needs and means of government.

I am not at all certain that at this point in history public expenditures in the United States would be much lower, if any, if conservatives set public policy rather than liberals. But I am sure that part of the funds would be allocated to other purposes than now, that the money would be spent in a different manner, that taxes to foot the bill would be differently structured, and that responsibility and decisionmaking power among levels of government would be significantly changed.

IS GOVERNMENT GROWING?

Before discussing the major ideological and policy issues I need to clarify some questions of fact. Conservatives have tended to show in their presentations that public spending has grown disproportionately fast in recent

¹ I am using the terms "liberal" and "conservative" in the sense in which they have come to be generally understood in the United States although this is a perversion of their original and true meaning and differs from their use abroad.

years and decades. But reports by liberals commonly reveal no extraordinary expansion. They say, or seem to be saying, that Government is not really growing when facts and figures are expressed in meaningful terms. Both sides back up their claims with the ceremonial impressiveness of research and statistical tables. Much as I hate to become involved in statistical arguments which are hard to unravel and explain, I cannot avoid dealing with this disagreement on the historical record.

Slightly over a year ago in a speech to the Committee for Economic Development President Johnson said:

"Total Federal spending in 1965 will be the lowest in 14 years in terms of our gross national product. . . . There are fewer Federal employees now than there were a year ago when I took office."

In his January 1965 budget message Mr. Johnson offered this comment:

"We have good reason to expect that Government expenditures in the years ahead will grow more slowly than the gross national product, so that the ratio of Federal spending to our total output will continue to decline . . . had Federal civilian employment kept its 1955 relationship to population, Federal employees would have totaled 2,747,000 on June 30, 1964, more than 275,000 above the actual number as of that date."

The conclusion from this is clear: Federal spending grows at a slower pace than the national product, Federal employment more slowly than population. That parallels the impression which a number of books and articles by liberal economists aim to give us.

Let us first talk about the size of governmental employment which has been a sensitive subject ever since the famous charge in the Declaration of Independence:

"He has . . . sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people; and eat out their substance."

Over the past 10 years Federal civilian employment grew 6 percent which is one-third of the rate of the simultaneous increase in the U.S. population of 18 percent. This seems to reverse a long-range historical trend: In the first half of this century the U.S. population doubled while Federal employment multiplied tenfold.

But, as so often, the total hides some significant facts:

Between 1955 and 1965 employment in the Defense Department declined by 13 percent, in the Post Office Department climbed 16 percent (almost parallel to population) and in the rest of the executive establishment jumped 31 percent. In other words, a sharp and disproportionate increase of Federal employment in domestic fields was partially offset by a cutback in defense. Moreover, the rise in Federal employment was kept down by delegating the field administration of most of the new and expanded Federal programs to State and local governments. Thus, the added employees were statistically classified as State and local, although they carry out programs enacted by Congress, work under orders from Washington agencies, and are at least in part paid from Federal funds.

Total governmental employment (Federal-State-local) jumped 46 percent over the past 10 years while U.S. population grew 18 percent, private employment 16 percent. In 1955 there was one person on the public payroll for every 8.1 in private employment, by 1965 the ratio was down to 1:6.2, and still falling.

Now let us look at the spending picture. The final fiscal data for 1965 are not yet available, but I am certain that when the new budget documents are released, in about 2 weeks, they will show that total Federal spending in 1965 (the cash-consolidated budget, not the administrative budget which omits about one-fourth of all Federal spending) as a percentage of gross national prod-

uct was not the lowest in 14 years, as President Johnson predicted it would. They will, however, disclose a remarkable record of stability in Federal spending in proportion to national product: Federal expenditures grew 73.5 percent over the past 10 years, gross national product 71.1 percent. This seems to confirm the statement that Government is not growing more rapidly than the national economy.

But we find a parallel here to what we discovered in Federal employment: Outlays for national defense increased 24 percent—barely ahead of the intervening rise in prices—and if we add space research and technology and international affairs to arrive at a total that we might call national security, they went up 37 percent. In other words, national security spending barely rose when expressed in constant dollars, and declined as a percentage of gross national product. The cost of domestic Government services meanwhile jumped 173 percent, an advance at two and a half times the rate of growth in gross national product. It may be worthwhile noting that the administration spent \$2 billion less for defense than it had estimated a year ago, \$3 billion more for all other purposes.

While Federal spending for civilian purposes soared 173 percent, personal consumption expenditures rose only 66 percent. Families and individuals increased their personal outlays for food by 40 percent, for clothing by 44 percent, for housing and household operations by 77 percent. In other words, government consumption gained sharply on personal consumption over the past 10 years.

To view the trend in historical perspective: It required 160 years—from 1789 to 1949—for Federal expenditures for civilian purposes to reach a level of \$10 billion. It took only another 17 years, to fiscal 1966, to lift them from \$10 billion to over \$54 billion. That dramatic boost in Federal spending since World War II is sometimes explained as having been made necessary by a lag on the part of State and local governments. But State and local governments raised their appropriations for local services several times faster than the simultaneous growth in population and prices. Just in the past 10 years they boosted expenditures from their own sources by 110 percent of which less than 40 percent can be attributed to added numbers of people and higher prices. On a per capita, constant dollar basis governmental spending (Federal-State-local) for domestic purposes grew at three times the rate of personal consumption between 1954 and 1964. This may have been good, bad or indifferent. But it does establish that the domestic activities of government have been growing at a dramatic rate, in relative as well as in absolute terms. And it suggests that we carefully consider where a continuation of current trends will take us.

THE COST OF GOVERNMENT

Governmental expenditures in the United States in 1964 equalled 32 percent of the gross national product and 39 percent of the national income, with most of those huge funds collected in the form of taxes. American taxpayers have been bearing their load with a remarkable patience, probably for two reasons: (1) Tax rates were boosted to their exorbitant levels during wartime when the public was prepared to put up with almost anything; (2) A substantial share of the taxes enjoys a low visibility, being hidden from sight through indirect taxation and withholding.

The share of defense (including space and foreign aid) has declined from 82 percent of all public expenditures in 1944 to 44 percent in 1954 and to 30 percent in 1964. But Government revenues still equal the percentage of gross national product they reached at the height of World War II. This means, (a) that taxation has been main-

tained at approximately its wartime level with cuts in some taxes offset by boosts in others, and, (b) that taxes were not kept high for defense but in order to expand the domestic activities of government.

It is now generally recognized that a burden of the size which the American taxpayer has been bearing for close to a quarter century represses economic growth. But hopes for effective tax relief are likely to be disappointed as long as public services keep growing at a spectacular pace.

Because heavy taxes are economically and politically painful, the U.S. Government has been reluctant to impose rates high enough to meet expenditures. Its budget has shown big deficits for 6 years in succession—and has been in the red for most of the past 36 years. This helped to keep taxes lower—but how much genuine relief did it provide?

The value of the dollar was cut to less than half over the past 25 years, which amounts to a confiscation of much of the lifetime savings and retirement income of many millions of men and women. Some of them just tightened their belts, some joined the ranks of our "poverty population," and not a few were forced to depend on public assistance or on charity. The big cushion of accumulated savings kept price rises to a more moderate level than might have been expected in so many years of budgetary deficits. But does perpetual inflation, which means expropriation from large segments of the population, seem to be a fair method of financing government?

The rate of inflation has turned more moderate in the past 10 years: consumer prices rose 18 percent, prices in the gross national product 22 percent. A 20-percent loss in 10 years may not appear excessive but when it is applied to fixed incomes or to insurance, bonds, or savings accounts over a long period or a lifetime, it amounts to a severe punishment of the provident for putting their trust in the dollar and the promises of the U.S. Government. It also boosts the interest cost of mortgages very substantially.

The dollar is further endangered by our continuing negative balance of payments and the resulting loss of one-third of our gold reserve. Although the private economy has had a consistently favorable balance of payments, Government action has almost exclusively focused on business activities—through restraints which are called voluntary and by threats of more drastic compulsory controls—instead of putting its own house in order.

The overall weight of taxation may possibly do less economic damage than its structure. Our income tax rate scale acts like a schedule of graduated speeding fines which are intended to discourage speeding. Some drivers will speed regardless, hoping to get away with it, but most will take it easy. So may taxpayers.

It is unlikely that men will work to the limit of their capacity if they know that a substantial share, or the greater share, of the product of their efforts will be taken from them. We put a penalty on effort and success and place a premium on leisure for the potentially most productive segment of our population. The top rate was cut from 91 percent to 70 percent in 1964 but the progressive character of the income tax was reinforced.

The economic cost of steeply progressive taxation is no deterrent to its proponents. Demand for redistribution of income through progressive taxes and parallel action on the spending side is a fundamental tenet of the liberal faith. It is based on the ethical concept that the rewards and punishments of the market are inherently unfair, that success is fortuitous and failure undeserved, that accidental and environmental factors rather than individual endeavor determine human fate, and that to correct those injustices,

Government must overrule the market through the political process.

Those who believe otherwise hold that there is a positive relationship between merit and success where market forces are permitted free play, that applied intelligence and sustained effort will as a rule and with some exceptions prevail over environment and find their deserved reward, and that consistent failure is no accident. They regard governmental redistribution of income through steep progressive taxation to be tyranny—besides being economically harmful.

A man from whom government takes 40, 50, or up to 70 cents out of every additional dollar he earns may regard this system as exploitation of an economically productive minority by a vote-strong majority and view his status as one of involuntary servitude to forces and for purposes he deems objectionable. If he cannot find an escape hatch—a so-called loophole—he may resolve not to serve (i.e., work) any more than he necessarily has to and prefer to extend his leisure.

The cost of big government of the type we have known for some years is probably greater than the number of dollars it spends. It includes the losses it causes by inflation, the slowdown in economic growth through ill-conceived taxation, the discouragement of some of its best talent to put forth a maximum effort.

THE SERVICES OF BIG GOVERNMENT

Most of the major services which government provides such as education, welfare, roads, parks, and dozens of others are legitimate subjects of public concern. Their benefits are all-pervading and society could not progress or even exist without them. They justify and require many billions of public spending. The question is: How much is genuinely needed and where do we reach the point of diminishing returns?

About 8 years ago John Kenneth Galbraith in "The Affluent Society" advanced the proposition that the consumer luxuriates while government and its services are being starved. His solution: tax the former more heavily so as to expand the latter. Galbraith has since become the prophet and spokesman for governmental expansion, probably more because of his eloquence than of his reporting of facts or economic analysis.

Those who oppose the Galbraith thesis are said to be "against government." This is sheer calumny. It makes no more sense to be against government than to be against electricity. Both are essential and friends of man—if they come in the right quantity, when and where needed. A surge of power, beyond need or capacity, at the wrong place or in the wrong form, will wreak havoc and may turn into a killer—whether it be electricity or government.

Many accepted the Galbraith thesis because it seemed to explain a well-known phenomenon: public services always appear to be inadequate or scarce—space for driving and parking, funds for assistance to needy, classrooms and teachers, public parks and sanitation and dozens of others. But there is no shortage of automobiles or TV sets or houses or clothing.

Why is this so? Because there is no limit to human wants or desires. Our appetite for private goods is disciplined by the necessity of paying for them. There can be no shortage of goods in a free market for people willing to pay a fair price (save for war or emergency conditions or temporary dislocations). When effective demand rises unexpectedly, supply will soon catch up with it.

But most public services are not paid for by the user directly or not fully; they seem to come "for free" with the cost borne by somebody else or by that distant abstraction "the government." And as long as goods can be

had gratis or below cost, demand will always exceed supply.

Galbraith ridiculed American extravagance in automobiles and homes and contrasted it with our miserliness toward schools and public parks. But the record tells us that over the past 10 years private spending for automobiles increased 75 percent, public spending for education 146 percent, private spending for housing and household operation 77 percent, for private recreation 76 percent, for local public parks and recreation 141 percent. If we carry the comparisons farther back, they show a similar picture. Public consumption has been rising twice as fast as personal.

Enrollment in public education grew 42 percent over the past 10 years, employment in public education 73 percent. School construction proceeded so rapidly that there are now three pupils less per classroom in the public schools than there were 10 years ago. Has this reduced the complaints about shortages? Of course not. We just lifted "standards." The number of public welfare employees jumped 61 percent in the past decade while the number of recipients rose only 34 percent. More welfare employees were authorized when Congress and State legislatures were promised that added staff would be able to "get people off the rolls" and make them self-supporting. What happened then? The population under 18 years increased by 27 percent, the number of families with a cash income under \$3,000 (in constant 1964 dollars) fell by almost 3 million (from 27 percent of all families to 18 percent) but the number of children on the AFDC rolls doubled.

Freeways are jammed and curb parking is filled up for miles around. This will continue no matter how much we spend on road construction as long as government lets drivers use freeways that cost up to \$23 million a mile without a direct charge and permits them to occupy precious street space for free or cheap storage instead of reserving it for moving traffic. If a department store marks desirable merchandise down to half price or gives it away, it will be mobbed and soon run out of goods. So will government. What would happen if gas or electricity were supplied as freeways are? Probably just what happened to water in New York where it is unmetered.

Of course, many public services cannot be charged to the user. But if they are financed at the local level, there is at least a semblance of a market test to balance desire for services with their tax cost. If the bill can be passed on to the national treasury, there will be no limit to demand.

Need for free public services is like greyhounds chasing a mechanical hare. No chance of catching up—ever. Demand will always be far ahead of supply because so-called standards will be pushed up as soon as performance approaches old standards.

As we tend to move away from the test of the market and the judgment of the community we are increasingly left in a storm-tossed sea without compass or anchor. If we leave it to those who are experts in or committed to a particular problem or function to judge how much we ought to spend on the object of their concern, we wind up in chaos. If we let special interest groups or local areas decide how much they get from the national treasury, we invite political log-rolling. And if we turn it over to men who have much to gain from added spending but need take no responsibility for facing the bill, we reap extravagance and inflation.

It is unfortunate that there are few objective and firm tests of how much needs to be spent on a public service and even fewer gages by which we can measure its results within a reasonable time. Cost-benefit ratios are largely hypothetical (you get the answer you put in), almost always highly controversial, and useful only in few fields. Govern-

ment lacks the impartial yardsticks which business applies to judge new projects and measure results. If government had produced the Edsel, it would still be making it—turning out huge quantities and giving them away below cost.

There is no automatic shutoff valve or circuitbreaker in government. Rather, the process seems like an endless spiral. As taxes go up taxpayers depend more heavily on government for services and feel more entitled to demand them. And as services are added, taxes go up again.

Over the span of American history much of the public task, of functions that required broad participation or couldn't pay their way, was accomplished by voluntary action, as Richard Cornuelle recently reminded us in an inspired book, "Reclaiming the American Dream." Civic initiative and performance have a proud and indeed unique record and retain a vast potential. But increasingly, publicly controlled programs have been not supplementing but supplanting voluntary action, hiring away its best talent, discouraging its supporters, quenching their enthusiasm, and threatening to dry up its support.

It may be hard to fight city hall but even tougher to compete with billions from the State capitals or Washington. Former University of Chicago Chancellor Lawrence A. Kimpton said some years ago: "It is hard to market a product at a fair price when somebody down the street is giving it away." Enrollment in higher education was evenly divided between public and private colleges not so long ago. At present trends private institutions will be lucky within a few years to enroll 20 percent of the students. That will mean a far heavier burden on taxpayers and a narrow choice (if any) for students. Will this advance the cause of education?

That government is engaged in many activities which are eminently beneficial, no reasonable man will deny. But in too many of its pursuits we must ask government: "Are you helping to solve the problem or are you part of the problem? Are you working toward a solution or are you making the problem insoluble and permanent?"

A faulty governmental program that does not involve the spending of huge amounts is remediable. When prohibition tried to solve a grave problem by a direct approach and turned out to be a cure worse than the disease, it was repealed. But it is well nigh impossible to abolish a big spending program. Its protagonists or recipients will deny that it has failed and explain results which did not come up to promises as the consequence of insufficient funding and inadequate time. According to its spokesmen there is nothing ever wrong with a public program that could not be corrected by doubling appropriation and staff, extending coverage and territory, or boosting salaries.

If consistent failure over many years would lead to corrective action, the farm support program would long have gone into limbo. It has not solved the problem of surpluses and low farm income and burdens the consumer and taxpayer twice: by higher food costs and by higher taxes.

At the rate at which we are going, the U.S. Government will within a few years have poured the astronomical sum of \$100 billion into farm price supports. But we are farther from a solution than ever and in spite of all attempts at control, had another record farm crop last year. Suggestions by the country's largest farm organization that Government prepare to get out of the program and ease into a free market are being coldshouldered.

It has been proven time and again that Government by setting a price above the market creates a surplus and by mandating a price below the market, whether on publicly supplied or privately produced goods and services, creates a shortage. If a store undertakes to sell \$1 bills for 50 cents, it will

soon run out of them and if it tries to sell them for \$2, it will keep them forever. That's why we have a shortage of driving and parking space, as I mentioned earlier, and why we have a surplus and unemployment of low-skilled workers whose wage rates are set by Government above the market and above their productive capacity. A further raise in minimum wages will condemn added people to perpetual unemployment and subsistence on the dole. And the farm price support program goes on and grows—while Government builds more big dams to supply farmers with irrigation water at a fraction of its cost—to grow more crops.

When the Social Security Act was proposed, 30 years ago, Congress and the public were told that old age and survivors and unemployment insurance would slowly but surely diminish the need for the dole (whose ill effects President Roosevelt decried), that it would reduce crime and juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, family break-up and numerous other social ills. Coverage and benefits were later expanded several times, disability insurance was added, but public assistance rolls kept growing at a rapid rate through periods of rising income—as did the rates of crime, juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, desertion, and the other evils which the welfare programs were supposed to cure or at least improve. That may have been no mere coincidence.

To be sure, social insurance has proven its worth and, in my opinion, ought to be expanded. But the federally directed public assistance program, judging by its results, is one of the worst failures among our governmental services. Suggestions to offer physically able persons work relief instead of a dole are being as strongly resisted as ever.

The urban renewal program is another example of misdirected governmental action. In a speech on May 27, 1962, New York Mayor Robert F. Wagner recognized this frankly:

"Once upon a time, we thought that if we could just bulldoze the slums and build shiny new public housing for low-income people, all social problems involving these people would virtually disappear. This has turned out to be not so.

"Once we thought that if we built enough playgrounds and other recreational facilities, juvenile delinquency would disappear. This turned out to be not so.

"Once we thought that having discovered a magic bullet to kill the micro-organisms that cause venereal disease, we had conquered venereal disease. That turned out to be not so.

"In these and many other instances, we solved one problem and uncovered two others."

Too often, well-intentioned governmental action did not just uncover two new problems for an old one. It created them.

Slightly over a year ago Martin Anderson in a penetrating analysis "The Federal Bulldozer" demonstrated the failure of the slum clearance program. In 13 years it destroyed more than four times as many dwellings as it constructed. Moreover, 9 out of every 10 of the new apartments were beyond the reach of the poverty families whose housing had been torn down. Civil rights groups now call it the "Negro removal program." Anderson concluded that the question is not whether urban renewal could be or should be revised. He suggested that it should be abolished because the promises held out for it proved to be a mirage, and the job could more effectively be done by private action.

A few weeks ago University of California Sociologist Nathan Glazer wrote that building new houses won't solve the slum problem because "the slums of any city will tend to equal the number of people defined as social problems, regardless of the quality of design and construction." But does anybody

believe that the urban renewal program will go anywhere but up—now that a newly created Cabinet Department can more effectively promote it?

The plight of the cities is coming in for growing attention and Life magazine devoted a double issue to the subject 2 weeks ago. It defined the cities' primary problems as money and jurisdiction. But money troubles—growing demand for public services and an inadequate tax base—are only symptoms of the disease; they are its result, not its cause. The middle and upper income classes which historically provided the cities' economic base and resources as well as civic leadership have been engaged in a mass exodus and are being replaced by new residents who have little to offer in support, contributions or leadership but need and demand vastly expanded public services. The trend seems to be intensifying and brews more trouble for cities in the years ahead.

The flight from the cities is not necessarily a natural phenomenon like the weather or earthquakes. It is of course partly due to rising affluence. But to a large extent it can be traced to perverse public policies. To be sure, city policies are not designed with the intent or for the purpose of driving out the higher and middle class families and attracting the poor—but they could not be much different if they were. Some of those policies are the result of Federal influence or commands. Many are city-made. So, people vote with their feet—to escape to a more congenial jurisdiction from a government whose course of action they found to be beyond their power to influence.

There is no sign that cities are about to adopt policies designed to reverse the trend of migration—to attract middle and upper income families and to discourage low income families from coming in and taking over. Nor are they likely to, as long as the National Government pays the greater share of public welfare and defrays 90 percent of the cost of freeways which make it easier and cheaper to commute to city jobs from distant suburbs. And because underpriced expressways bankrupt commuter railroads, the Federal Treasury is now starting to subsidize the building of rapid transit lines.

To abolish poverty is a noble idea but certainly no new idea. The American people have long been engaged in the most effective antipoverty program the world has ever seen. They changed the historical distribution of income from a pyramid to the shape of a pear or diamond. Between 1929 and 1963 the number of households with an income under \$2,000 a year (1963) declined from 30 percent of all families to 11 percent; of those under \$4,000 income, from 68 percent to 29 percent. But though some tried, nobody has yet succeeded in eliminating the lowest 20 percent from the statistical tables.

A few billion dollars of public money would indeed be a cheap price to pay for a program that can wipe out poverty in our midst within a few years, or within our lifetime. But what proof is there that it can? It is yet too early to judge the results of the new antipoverty program. But already the major agencies administering it, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education, find themselves engaged in campaigns all over the country to overcome the objections of mayors, boards of education, and communities. The mayors are of course not opposed to getting Federal money and spending it. They agree with the program's major goals but not with its methods. The Federal agencies succeed in breaking down resistance only by using their power to hand out or deny several billions of Federal money—an argument to which every elected official must sooner or later submit. It is apparent that State and local authorities would not apply their own tax funds to the type of program now instituted

if compliance were not a condition for getting a share of the Federal money.

The theory that underlies the present Federal programs is that poverty is a deficiency which is bound to perpetuate itself through generations unless eradicated by governmental action of the type now being initiated. If that hypothesis were true, most of America's 194 million residents would still be poor, ignorant and unemployed, as their ancestors were when they landed on these shores. It seems to me that the history of the United States, of our strong mobility upward and downward, stands as living proof of the fundamental error in this theory. The American record suggests that the condition of poverty is not so much a cause but a result, and that it can best be remedied—in cases where it can be remedied—by the individual.

Undoubtedly, certain of the new programs will help some of their participants to overcome handicaps and to improve their productive capacity. But they may also be sowing the seeds of social ills worse than those they set out to cure. One thing seems certain: that the antipoverty program accelerates the trend toward monolithic government in the United States.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND CENTRALIZATION OF POWER

In establishing a federal structure with an intricate system of checks and balances the Founding Fathers aimed to disperse authority so widely that no one branch or level of government and above all, no one man, could prevail over the others. They concluded from history that concentration of power corrupts and sooner or later leads to abuse and tyranny.

We all know that within our lifetime—of the older generation, that is—an unprecedented transfer of power took place which tremendously strengthened the hand of the National Government and particularly of the President. The most potent factor in this shift was the growth of Federal grants-in-aid which now total over \$14 billion. Through over 200 authorizations they give Federal agencies the deciding voice in most public services which used to be determined and run by State legislatures, city councils, school boards and by the communities themselves. The issue is not that of historical States rights. It is an issue of individual rights—because freedom is indivisible. A central government that holds sway over local governments also holds sway over individuals. Most residents of the United States are now dependent upon the National Government in some form—for wages, promotions, grants, subsidies, orders, or pensions—or are subject to favors or harassment by regulatory or tax enforcement agencies. Few can afford any longer to voice objections to Presidential policies or commands (euphemistically called voluntary guidelines) or dare stand up for their rights. Enforced consensus and conformity have become the rule because the penalty for deviation is too severe.

As long as we maintain local diversity, citizens who find themselves in the minority in their home areas can move to jurisdictions whose policies or governments they prefer. When uniformity is imposed, the individual's choice and the right of communities to exercise home rule and local autonomy end.

The multiplication of Federal grants had led to a vertical functional autocracy of the Washington bureaucracy which supersedes the self-government of local areas that used to characterize the American scene. If grants were intended to aid States and local governments, as is often asserted, they could be given without conditions, to be spent at the discretion of local authorities. That was in fact proposed in 1964 by Walter Heller when he was Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. But the Heller plan was quickly killed because Federal agencies

would not have been able to control the actions of States, counties, cities, or school boards. Other proposals, of allocating certain Federal taxes to States or local governments or to permit tax credits for State and local taxes, suffered the same fate, and for the same reason.

Big government means concentration of power in the hands of the Central Government with all the consequences which such a power monopoly implies.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND SECURITY

Adequate protection of the lives and safety of its citizens is government's first and foremost commitment. For this reason the United States devotes bigger resources to national defense than to any other single public function. But the share of defense has been falling and of last account totaled only 30 percent of all government expenditures, as I mentioned earlier. It was this decline that enabled domestic services of government to stage a dramatic expansion over the past 20 years. The question is: What came first? What was the controlling consideration in the changed allocation of public funds?

In a carefully documented study of post-war budget formation, Samuel P. Huntington of the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, found:

"In both the Truman administration before the Korean war and in the Eisenhower administration after the war, the tendency was:

"1. To estimate the revenues of the Government or total expenditures possible within the existing debt limit;

"2. To deduct from this figure the estimated cost of domestic programs and foreign aid; and

"3. To allocate the remainder to the military."

This suggests that defense was allocated whatever money was left after everybody else got his share.

More recently, however, the Department of Defense has been acting as its own budget cutter—in contrast to other agencies which fight hard for the highest possible appropriations. At the 1964 National Tax Conference a high Defense Department official² answered a charge that Federal agencies were pushing for expansion:

"Oddly enough, the bureaucrats in Washington, certainly in the Defense Department, are the ones that are trying to hold down Government expenditures in the appropriation of funds. In the last few years—and this extends into the Eisenhower administration and even into the Truman administration—we've had to fend off additional moneys voted by the Congress for particular projects.

"So we're put under pressure from all sources: from the Congress, from the public, from interested associations to spend more money and I think on balance we resist more than we yield."

That would be all to the good if our national security position versus potential aggressors, that is, forces which would destroy us if given a chance, had improved in the period since World War II and if our relative defensive strength had grown in recent years. But those propositions are highly doubtful, to say the least.

The Soviet Union devotes twice as large a share of gross national product to national defense as the United States, as Timothy Sosnovy, Soviet economy specialist at the Library of Congress, has pointed out and the threat from Red China is growing every year. Communist countries have vastly expanded their territory and population, their economic, technological and military power over the past 20 years, and they have been

able to raise their status and influence in the rest of the world and make our position more vulnerable or at least more difficult.

The rapid dismantling of our Armed Forces after World War II invited the Communist takeover of Eastern Europe and large sections of Asia. Aggression in Korea, Vietnam, and other places was not unrelated to our seeming unpreparedness. In Korea our troops were almost pushed into the sea and the United States, for the first time in its history, had to settle for a draw. In Vietnam we have for some years now been unable to cope with a seemingly far inferior opponent.

The number of military projects or programs scrapped, deferred, or slowed down in recent years is in the hundreds. They were not discarded because military experts doubted their value or effectiveness in strengthening our defenses. The decisions fell against the military because the expansion of domestic services was deemed more urgent by the powers that be.

The Skybolt air-to-ground missile, nuclear rocket Rover, manned space glider Dyna Soar, Pluto ram jet rocket engine and numerous other projects were turned down although the leaders of our Armed Forces demanded them. Approval of nuclear carriers was denied and authorization of manned (follow-on) bombers too long delayed.

A fallout shelter program which could save millions of lives and might deter a would-be aggressor was deemed to be too expensive as was an effective anti-missile-missile system. A few months ago the Nike X missile seemed to be on the verge of approval. When escalation in Vietnam called for larger funds, were offsetting savings to be made by tightening up on civilian type services? Not at all. The Nike X antimissile missile and other defense projects fell victim to budget cutting. Again, as in earlier years, the armed services lost out to more charmed services—domestic welfare programs. The consequences of such policy are awesome to contemplate.

Potentially more critical to national security than money are the time, attention, and efforts of our governmental leaders which are now overwhelmingly spent on domestic affairs. Inadequate study and consideration may have been responsible for the Bay of Pigs disaster and for many other troubles which flare up from time to time in distant parts of the world.

"Congress Needs Help" was the title of a recent investigation and TV review of the inability of "absurdly overworked" Congressmen to be adequately informed on the vital issues they are called upon to decide. Members of Congress cannot give sufficient time, study, and thought to defense and international affairs because they are overloaded with civilian projects. The President, according to the a Newsweek story of December 20, 1965, explained that in 1965 he had concentrated on civilian affairs "to get the domestic problems out of the way so that I could give more time to foreign problems." Some may regard this to be the wrong order of priority. In this day and age a President might conceivably be so occupied with our national security that he could not devote most of his time to pushing the expansion of domestic public services.

Our safety at home is no better protected than our security abroad. In fact, it may be less so. An American, or a local resident, can walk the streets of most major foreign cities without fear, even at night. But that may not be advisable in some residential neighborhoods of Washington, Chicago, and other metropolitan centers. The failure of government to safeguard its citizens is now so widely recognized that a book "How To Protect Yourself on the Streets and in Your Home" (accompanied by a letter from the head of the FBI) seems to be on the way to

becoming a bestseller. (This may be an interesting reverse shift in responsibility: from government to the individual.)

The United States, the country with the highest standards of living, is also the world's most crime ridden. The most powerful Nation which once set out to make the world safe for democracy seems unable or unwilling to make its city streets safe for walking home at night. Crime is rising six times as fast as the population according to the latest FBI report.

There is only one possible explanation for this phenomenon: we have not been able to convince would-be offenders that "crime doesn't pay." They expect to get away with it. And they may well have concluded from a study of reports on crimes, arrests, convictions and terms actually served, that the statistical odds are not too discouraging.

It is obvious that governmental action in combating and suppressing crime is woefully inadequate. But so far not enough has been done about it—nor about the fact that almost 50,000 men and women are killed each year in traffic accidents, largely because governmental attention and effort are preoccupied with other pursuits.

In conclusion: Government has multiplied its domestic activities in recent decades, making a steadily growing number of Americans dependent upon its benefits and favors, extending the area of coercion, while not adequately meeting its responsibility to protect the safety of the Nation and the individual. That course, if pursued much longer, gravely threatens personal and collective liberty and security. It is high time for us to quit devising new programs which Government may adopt or enlarge as substitutes for personal effort and to start thinking of means to strengthen the challenge to the individual to deal with his own problems.

Government can be and should be man's best friend—and it is, if it fulfills its primary tasks well. To the extent to which it neglects its foremost duties in order to expand recklessly in other directions and harms the body politic, it becomes a foe and should, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, be altered. The time has not come when we can afford to abolish it.

DOLLAR BLOCKADE OF CUBA NEEDED

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the United States to declare a dollar blockade of Cuba so that American taxpayer funds do not contribute to the export of Communist subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere. I make this suggestion after observing plans by the United Nations to provide Cuba with over \$3 million in special funds for the University of Havana and an agricultural research station. Please keep in mind that the United States contributes 40 percent of the funds used by that U.N. special agency.

It means that \$1.2 million of U.S. money would be used in the project. And what do they teach at Havana "U"? More subversion of the hemisphere, of course, because the university branch to be helped is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel.

² Henry E. Glass, Economic Adviser to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

Brazil and Paraguay have strongly objected to helping Castro through the U.N., and for good reason. Brazil and Paraguay are both principal targets of Communist subversion directed from Cuba. Just last month the Communist tricontinental congress on subversion was held in Cuba and was formally designated as the headquarters of Communist subversion in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. If we contribute funds to this unwarranted U.N. project we will be underwriting that subversion.

A similar effort to provide U.N. funds for Castro's Cuba was scrapped 3 years ago due to protests from many of us in the Congress. Apparently the planners do not give up easily, but my opposition to such a scheme remains just as strong.

I was dismayed by the published reports of the official U.S. attitude toward such assistance to Cuba as stated by U.N. Ambassador Roosevelt. He says the United States will register an objection on principle, but will not withhold our share of the fund or demand rejection of the proposal. This is bureaucratic doubletalk of the worst order. It is inconceivable that any government can be against something as frightening as communism and still support it.

Mr. Speaker it is hoped that public and congressional indignation will defeat this latest proposal as it did 3 years ago.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in offering congratulations to the freedom-loving people of Estonia and her many sons and daughters in America as they observe February 24 as the anniversary of Estonia's declaration of independence. It is sincerely hoped that the encouragement and good wishes expressed by many today will serve to further inspire the Estonian people to resist communism.

The fact that modern Estonia has been under the heel of the U.S.S.R. continually since 1944 and has not succumbed to Soviet pressures to accept communism is a truly remarkable accomplishment.

Today I would like to call attention to one particular argument to which the Communists like to refer, namely, the allegation that since membership in the Soviet Union, Estonia's industrial expansion has increased. What is not said and what we should remember is that before the U.S.S.R. captured Estonia in 1944 the country had substantial industries of its own.

The Soviets applied enormous pressures and exercised almost inhuman cruelty against the people to increase industrial output. Furthermore, this was done at the expense of providing consumer goods and a program for increasing the living standards of the Estonian

people, areas in which the Soviets exercised almost total disinterest. It is estimated by competent authorities that the Estonian people are materially in worse condition today than they were 25 years ago.

It is conditions like these to which the free world must address itself in shedding light on actual conditions of the millions of people held captive by U.S.S.R. Our continued observance of the historic declaration of independence on February 24, 1918, is an indication to all the world that Estonia's plight is of concern to us and that we are committed to her liberty.

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM SUPPORTS A STRONG VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Young Americans for Freedom—YAF—has been recognized as the leading student organization in the Nation supporting a strong U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam. Practically since its founding in 1960, YAF has been regarded as a highly effective conservative youth organization, and YAF's position on the Vietnam question has given it greater recognition.

It goes without undue comment that I am highly interested in the student developments regarding Vietnam throughout the Nation, but the activities of college students both for and against the U.S. position in Vietnam on the college campuses of the Southern States are of particular interest to me.

It has been encouraging to learn of student organizations, like YAF, who are supporting a strong U.S. foreign policy. During the past year the student protest demonstrations from the left have grown in proportion, size, number, and volume. It is gratifying to a Member of Congress to hear of responsible student organizations like YAF, the Young Republicans, and even the Young Democrats in some instances, who are not only offsetting the leftwing student protests by having rallies supporting a strong Vietnam policy but who are also launching many constructive programs.

Mr. Speaker, the position of YAF on foreign policy questions is derived from the Sharon statement which was adopted in conference at Sharon, Conn., September 9-11, 1960, at the founding of the organization. In the Sharon statement are found the guidelines for determination of YAF's position on foreign policy questions:

In this time of moral and political crisis, it is the responsibility of the youth of America to affirm certain eternal truths.

We as young conservatives, believe:

That we will be free only so long as the national sovereignty of the United States is secure; that history shows periods of free-

dom rare, and can exist only when free citizens concertedly defend their rights against all enemies;

That the forces of international communism are, at present, the greatest single threat to these liberties;

That the United States should stress victory over, rather than coexistence with, this menace; and

That American foreign policy must be judged by this criterion: does it serve the just interests of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving on the National Advisory Board of YAF along with many distinguished Members of the two Houses. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], serve with me on this Advisory Board. In addition to these Members from the Southern States, there are 30 more Members from the two Houses who also serve on that board.

Mr. Speaker, last fall I had the distinct pleasure of speaking at a testimonial dinner honoring one of the greatest men of the other House, the Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND. This testimonial dinner was held in Birmingham, Ala., a city of fond memories to the Senator.

At this testimonial dinner, the Senator made some pertinent comments regarding the Vietnam question. In part the Senator stated:

On the international scene, you are faced with dangers to freedom from a succession of little wars and the even more dangerous diplomatic remedies to terminate them, as is demonstrated by the events this year in the Dominican Republic, and, I fear, may be soon again demonstrated in Vietnam. The military action of the Communists in Vietnam is at this point of less peril to freedom than is the potential for concessions to the Communist aggressors which may be granted in the terms of a political termination of the military hostilities.

The Senator went on to comment:

The greatest threat is an idea, or, more precisely, a mental attitude or orientation, even a way of thinking, which is induced by an idea.

Mr. Speaker, the Senator concluded his moving address by a challenge to the young people of America which bears directly on the Vietnam issue:

In your own time, however, you are faced with a prevalence of moral and political relativism, which is more extensive, more pervasive and more dangerous than ever before. It is your greatest obstacle in your struggle for freedom. You are the best hope for freedom. You can fulfill your promise if

you will but resist moral and political relativism by continuing your disciplined adherence to an absolute code of spiritual and philosophical values. You must continue to refuse to compromise with expediency. You must maintain the courage to defy the consensus. You must continue to choose the harder right instead of the easier wrong.

Young Americans for Freedom, as many other organizations throughout the South, have answered this call.

At the national convention of the organization, commemorating its fifth anniversary, here in the Nation's Capital early last fall, the YAF delegates unanimously passed a resolution calling for the commitment of sufficient number of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam. YAF applauded the commitment of United States might and prestige on behalf of South Vietnam and supported the recognition that the war must be won on the ground as military success is a precondition for the political and social developments which will ultimately decrease the ability of the Communists to lure peasants into giving aid and comfort to the Vietcong.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Whereas we share the administration's view that what the Communists chose to call "wars of national liberation" constitute nothing more than a new form of aggression which must be resisted as a threat to the establishment of true peace; and

Whereas the current aggression against South Vietnam takes its primary inspiration and direction from the north and has as its ultimate object the conquest of all of southeast Asia, a fact recognized by those countries in the area who have sent significant amounts of combat personnel to share in the burden of defeating the Communists; and

Whereas we believe that this Nation is required by considerations of national interest and by moral considerations of the highest order to come to the aid of the people of South Vietnam and other countries of southeast Asia in their defense against aggression; and

Whereas while South Vietnam fails to measure up to the full standards of freedom to which we in this country have become accustomed, the present form of government nevertheless affords a greater opportunity for the ultimate development of truly liberal institutions than would a Communist regime: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Young Americans for Freedom applauds the commitment of U.S. might and prestige on behalf of South Vietnam and supports the recognition that this war must be won on the ground in South Vietnam as military success is a precondition for the political and social developments which will ultimately decrease the ability of Communist recruiters to lure local peasants into giving aid and comfort to the Vietcong; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration demonstrate its intent to take whatever action proves tactically necessary to assure that the successful termination of the war will not be unduly delayed, including such measures as (a) the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam, (b) effective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Haiphong, (c) the beginning, by calculated aerial and naval bombardment, of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam, (d) by instituting a naval and air blockade of North Vietnam, all of these steps to be taken to

induce North Vietnam to cease in its support of the troops in the south, and (e) the clear communication to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies such as Nationalist China.

YAF's activities in the Southern States have followed a well-designed pattern of constructive action. In Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, YAF chapters have engaged in constructive activities supporting the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, a news article in the Wednesday, October 27, 1965, edition of the Durham, N.C., Sun, entitled, "Leader in YAF Hits Protesters," illustrates the attitude of YAF toward the leftwing protest demonstrations. The article follows:

LEADER IN YAF HITS PROTESTERS

WASHINGTON.—A leader of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) blasted the student anti-Vietnam protests here in the Nation's capital today as a deliberate attempt to defeat the cause of freedom in Asia and the world.

In making the denouncement, Randal C. Teague, a member of YAF's board of directors and the leader of its southern program, said, "Students who are burning their draft cards and organizing programs to avoid the draft and to thwart the American effort against communism in Asia are in a minority on the college campus. What they are doing is wrong—legally and morally. Those who are in violation of Federal laws should be prosecuted and severely punished by the courts."

Teague, a student himself, went on to say, "These students are not conscientious objectors. Their actions show shades of absolute anarchy. As many national leaders have pointed out, there is strong evidence that many of these protests have been led by the extremists of the radical left who often associate themselves with Communist-leaning groups. Responsible students have no sympathy with those who are deliberately flaunting the law by burning their draft cards, by blocking troop and supply convoys, and worst of all, by demoralizing those valiant fighting men in Vietnam today who are risking their lives to insure the security of freemen."

The YAF leader concluded by saying, "When our Nation issues a call to arms, it is our duty to respond to it, whether we personally like it or not. Every American, from the youngest to the oldest, deserves to support his Government in time of national emergency, and surely the war in Vietnam is one of the gravest situations confronting the world today."

At its recent national convention in Washington, YAF passed a strong resolution unanimously calling for the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam. The resolution also called for effective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Haiphong, the beginning by calculated aerial and naval bombardment of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam, and by the institution of naval and air blockade of North Vietnam. The resolution concluded with the call to issue a clear communication to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies.

In a telegram dated November 1, 1965, the Southern region of YAF called upon the Attorney General of the United States to prosecute violators of Federal

draft statutes. The text of the telegram follows:

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

The Southern region of Young Americans for Freedom representing thousands of responsible college students strongly supports Justice Department efforts to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes. These violators must be prosecuted if respect for law and order is to prevail. We urge full execution of Public Law 89-152 against all draft card burners. We commend efforts to prosecute those deliberately disrupting the American war effort. While we support the right to peaceful protests, we cannot condone riotous demonstrations. In our opinion many of the recent protests border on sedition and treason. We support a strong administration policy on winning the war at home as well as abroad.

RANDAL C. TEAGUE,
Regional Director.

Mr. Speaker, an appropriate release to the newspapers, radio, and television media was issued subsequent to this telegram to make clear to the public the position of YAF on the draft-card burners. I ask unanimous consent that this release may appear in the RECORD at this point.

STUDENT LEADER ASKS KATZENBACH TO PROSECUTE DRAFT VIOLATORS—NOVEMBER 1, 1965

WASHINGTON.—A southern student leader today supported the Justice Department in arresting and prosecuting violators of Federal draft laws.

Randal C. Teague, a national board of directors member of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and its southern spokesman, advised Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach in a telegram today that "the southern region of YAF, representing thousands of responsible college students, strongly supports Justice Department efforts to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes."

Teague went on to say, "These violators must be prosecuted if respect for law and order is to prevail. We urge full execution of Public Law 89-152 against all draft-card violators." Public Law 89-152 is the law carrying a fine of \$10,000 or 5 years' imprisonment, or both, for any person who knowingly destroys or mutilates his draft card. The law was enacted to carry a severe penalty against the draft-card burners at recent student demonstrations against U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The telegram concluded, "We commend efforts to prosecute those deliberately disrupting the American war effort. While we support the right to peaceful protests, we cannot condone riotous demonstrations. In our opinion, many of the recent protests border on sedition and treason. We support a strong administration policy on winning the war at home as well as abroad."

YAF is regarded as the leading student group supporting a strong policy in Vietnam. Its national chairman, Tom Huston, of Indiana, appeared on ABC's "Issues and Answers" this past Sunday to present the opinion of students supporting a strong U.S. policy in Asia.

YAF has a southernwide program of donating blood to American soldiers in Vietnam, aiding refugees and orphans fleeing from war-torn North Vietnam, sending mail to our American soldiers, praising them, to let them know the majority of American students are behind them, a petition campaign in support of a strong administration policy, and the presentation of debates and speeches on Vietnam on various campuses.

During my recent tour of South Vietnam and southeast Asia, one of the problems of the war which struck me most clearly was the lack of sufficient material support from our allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and from our allies throughout the free world. While the Republic of South Korea and the Australian Government have sent troops to South Vietnam, the remainder of the free nations of Asia or the free world have contributed little to winning this war against aggression. Unfortunately, Allied support is far from being at the level required to sustain the effort.

YAF realized this shortcoming in our foreign policy efforts, and in an attempt to inform the American people, on and off the college campus, of this inadequacy, the southern offices issued a call for more Allied support in Vietnam. This release follows:

STUDENT GROUP CALLS FOR ALLIED SUPPORT IN VIETNAM—NOVEMBER 8, 1965

WASHINGTON.—The southern spokesman of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) called for greater military and economic support in Vietnam from our allies today. Randal C. Teague, a student at the American University in the Nation's Capital, called for expanded assistance to win the war in Vietnam from our allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and from throughout the free world.

In making the pronouncement, Teague said, "Since 1961, the United States has borne the burden alone of defending South Vietnam and its people. Not only the security of all Asia but ultimately the security of all nations will depend on the outcome of this war. It is time that our allies help the United States win the war. Mere moral support is not enough."

Teague went on to say, "We not only need more fighting men and materials, but winning the war in Vietnam will require greater commitments of medical corpsmen to doctor the civilians, schoolteachers to educate the children, engineers and construction teams to build roads and hospitals, and agricultural experts to increase food production. We must win the war with the people, and our allies are surely in a position to supply the technicians required to help the people."

He concluded by saying, "President Johnson and the administration should not only encourage our allies to help us secure the freedom of South Vietnam because of Communist China's continual threat to Asia, but they should also encourage our allies to stop trading and shipping with Communist China and North Vietnam. Our American soldiers are being shot at and killed by North Vietnamese soldiers whose nation is being economically aided by our allies. It just doesn't make sense."

With the exception of troop commitments from South Korea and Australia, very little assistance has come from our allies.

YAF is regarded as one of the leading student organizations backing a strong policy in Vietnam. The student group has launched programs on college campuses in the Southern States to donate blood to American fighting men, to collect food and clothing for refugees fleeing war-torn North Vietnam, to have fraternities and sororities adopt Vietnamese orphans, and to offset the student protest demonstrations.

One of the problems in the college movement in this Nation in support of a strong administration policy has been proper coordination of activities. When blood donation drives, petition cam-

paigns, debates, speeches, and many other actions are going on simultaneously across the Nation and throughout the South, it is difficult to get across to the American people that these actions are more significant and more representative of true student opinion than the one-shot protest demonstrations led by the radical left.

In order to obtain the needed coordination throughout the Southern States, Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., is sponsoring the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee—SSVVC—which is calling upon the support of all campus organizations supporting a strong policy. They have called upon support from the College Young Republican clubs, the Young Democratic clubs, YAF chapters, and any other independent or affiliated group.

The purposes of SSVVC were outlined in a release of November 23, 1965, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD at this point.

SOUTHERN STUDENT VICTORY IN VIETNAM COMMITTEE FORMED—NOVEMBER 23, 1965

WASHINGTON.—The formation of the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee—SSVVC—to support a strong U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam by the demonstration of student support was announced here in the Nation's Capital today. The new committee will operate on over a hundred college campuses in eight States of the South.

The committee's formation was announced by Randal C. Teague, the southern spokesman for the Young Americans for Freedom, Inc. (YAF), a conservative youth group, and Alfred Regnery, the national director of the recently held symposium for freedom in Vietnam and YAF's national college director.

In announcing the formation of SSVVC, Teague, who is its southernwide field director, said, "We seek the earnest support and cooperation of all college students and organizations who are supporting a firm policy in southeast Asia. We will serve as the principal vehicle through which all student activities in support of the U.S. policy in South Vietnam can be channeled. We call for the support and cooperation from the college Young Republican clubs, the Young Democratic clubs, the YAF chapters, and any other student organization, affiliated or independent, which seeks victory in Vietnam."

Teague, a student at the American University in Washington, D.C., went on to say, "Much student activity has already been going on in the South, but during the next year this activity will greatly increase. It is not only desirable, but essential, that these activities be properly coordinated. SSVVC is such a coordinating unit."

SSVVC will undertake programs on college campuses to sponsor debaters and speakers on over 50 college campuses; to sponsor blood donation drives to give blood for American fighting men in South Vietnam; to form local Victory in Vietnam Committees on 107 campuses which serve as target sights; to send food and clothing to refugees and orphans fleeing North Vietnam; to have college fraternities and sororities adopt orphan children in Vietnam; to circulate petitions calling for a strong foreign policy position in southeast Asia; and several other constructive programs.

SSVVC and its cooperating groups will participate closely with the International Youth Crusade for Freedom in Vietnam with debate-in's on December 7 and student rallies

supporting the war effort on January 7 and 8 of next year. YAF leaders are challenging members of leftwing student protest groups which have been instrumental in the burning of draft cards to debates on December 7, the anniversary of Pearl Harbor attack. Major rallies have been planned for January throughout the world.

In addition to Teague and Regnery, the steering committee of SSVVC will be composed of the field directors for each State within the jurisdiction of the new committee. The steering committee's membership was announced as Judy Whorton, a student at Samford University in Birmingham; Timothy C. Ohr, a student at St. Petersburg, Fla., Junior College; Guy W. Mayes, Jr., a student at Emory University in Atlanta; James E. Green, a student at Duke University in Durham, N.C.; Charles C. Hooks, Jr., a recent graduate of the University of North Carolina now residing in Gaffney, S.C.; Michael Everhart, a student at Southwestern at Memphis; and Thomas B. Wright, Jr., a student at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va.

An indication of the substantial public support which the SSVVC received is an editorial which appeared in the Clearwater, Fla., Sun of Monday, December 6, 1965. This editorial follows:

PROTESTING THE PROTESTERS

With the activities of the right-leaning Young Americans for Freedom most middle-of-the-roads cannot always see eye to eye, but with the latest YAF project few can take exception—their creation of the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee.

The newest YAF project thus becomes part of a growing national protest against the draft dodgers, draft card burners, and peace demonstrators.

As announced by Randal C. Teague, a former Pinellas County resident and now a student at the American University in Washington, D.C., the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee has been organized to support a strong U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam, and will operate on a hundred college campuses in this country.

Teague details the aims of the new youth movement:

"We seek the earnest support and cooperation of all college students and organizations who are supporting a firm policy in southeast Asia. We will serve as the principal vehicle through which all student activities in support of the U.S. policy in South Vietnam can be channeled. We call for the support and cooperation from the college Young Republican Clubs, the Young Democratic Clubs, the YAF chapters, and any other student organization, affiliated or independent, which seeks victory in Vietnam."

Some of the projects of the SSVVC, reports Teague, will be to undertake programs on college campuses, sponsoring debates and speakers; to sponsor blood donation drives to give blood for American fighting men in South Vietnam; to form local Victory in Vietnam Committees on 107 campuses; to send food and clothing to refugees and orphans fleeing North Vietnam; to have college fraternities and sororities "adopt" orphan children in Vietnam; to circulate petitions calling for a strong policy position in southeast Asia.

Tomorrow, the 24th anniversary of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, will find the new group participating with the International Youth Crusade for Freedom for Vietnam with debates with leftwing student protest groups which have been instrumental in the burning of draft cards.

We welcome YAF to the fast-growing ranks of young people and Americans generally

who are getting plenty fed up with this left-wing lunatic fringe, and who are letting our servicemen in Vietnam know in no uncertain terms that we are behind them all the way.

Mr. Speaker, the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee has been successful. Civic support of the campus program, as indicated in the Clearwater Sun article, has come from every area of the South.

At a regional conference of YAF's State officers for the Southern region, held in Atlanta on February 12, new Vietnam-related programs were formulated to spearhead an even larger program to support a strong policy in Vietnam.

YAF has been cautious in handling the Vietnamese situation. They are supporting a strong policy—not just an administration policy. They are prepared to deviate from the policy of any administration when that policy does not coincide with the necessary action required to sustain the war against Communist aggression. YAF has been and will continue to be, I am sure, committed to an administration policy only so long as that policy is consistent with that criterion set forth in the Sharon statement for determining American foreign policy: does it serve the just interests of the United States?

HORTON URGES REDEDICATION TO LIBERATION OF ESTONIA

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the observance by our fellow Americans of Estonia's 48th anniversary of its declaration of independence is a fitting tribute to the Estonian people. The hope is ever present that through commemorating this event of Estonian history, those Estonians now held captive and in virtual slavery by the Russian Communists will continue to be inspired to resist Russian efforts to make them reject their historic cultural heritage.

In man's quest for liberty, few struggles surpass those of Estonian patriots. From Russian occupation between 1721-1918 Estonia not only succeeded in surmounting Russification programs, but Estonian culture actually thrived. During that period even though under Russia's heavy oppressive control, Estonia's music, poetry, plays, and books flourished. A remarkable tribute to a tenacious people. In addition, this period also nurtured Estonian nationalism which showed itself in the Estonian rebellion of 1905. Though Russian soldiers ruthlessly crushed the revolt, the spark of nationalism still burned and emerged again in 1917-18.

Under Russia's provisional government of 1917, autonomy was granted to Estonia. She was given the right to elect a parliament and administer her

own laws. German successes in pushing Russian troops out of much of the Baltic area encouraged the Estonian Government to proclaim Estonia an independent state. That declaration was issued on February 24, 1918, and for the next 2 years the fledgling nation was forced to fight both Germans and Russians in order to preserve its independence. Finally on February 2, 1920, the Communists signed a treaty in which all previous claims over Estonian territory were renounced.

The next 20 years were busily spent on improving the domestic situation, but the Estonian people kept a constant vigil on Russian intentions. That policy was well founded as the infamous Mutual Assistance Treaty of 1939 indicated. The treaty enabled Russian forces to legally occupy Estonian territory. Not content with the treaty provisions, Russia presented Estonia with an ultimatum on June 16, 1940, which amounted to complete capitulation. Through Russian manipulation and intimidation a new Estonian Government amenable to Moscow took over on June 21, 1940. In July this government proclaimed Estonia a Soviet Socialist Republic.

From mid-1941 to the end of 1944, nazism replaced Russian terror, murder, and deportation. But unfortunately for the Estonians, World War II's end resulted in the return of Russian occupation and membership in the Soviet Union.

The tragedy and suffering of Estonia's people under Soviet Russia are almost beyond belief. Their ability to endure and continue their own culture in light of Russian occupation and impositions is a truly marvelous feat. But how long can we expect that resistance to continue without more tangible aid from the free world? In an attempt to help alleviate this problem I have sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 290 which would have the President instruct our United Nations representative to initiate action on Russia's forced occupation of the Baltic States.

I know and feel what this day represents to men and women of Estonian origin the world over. I am privileged to represent a large number of these people living in the Rochester, N.Y., area. It is my fervent hope that as Estonians and their millions of supporters in America commemorate Estonia's 48th anniversary they will rededicate themselves to work together for their people's liberation and freedom.

TO IMPROVE THE WEATHER FORECASTING SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, southern California has been besieged by the most violent storms in recent history during the past few months and costly damage to private, commercial, and military property has been widespread. Continued interruptions in air and land operations of the military have resulted from sudden storms and the same interferences have caused considerable indisposition to commercial and private traffic as well.

Agricultural operators have suffered greatly from the recent unusual weather conditions and all of these interests may well have fared better if sufficient advance storm warnings had been available. Across the border in Mexico the damage from these storms has been even more devastating and the loss of life, far greater. The region south and southwest of San Diego seems to be the area from which a great many of these violent storms approach. It has long been recognized as a sparse data area for meteorological information, and this fact has recently been confirmed again to me by the Administrator of our Environmental Services Administration. Some information is obtained on an irregular basis through our cooperative program of taking observations by merchant ships and aircraft crews of international flights who report in-flight weather conditions when passing through that region. We also receive some satellite surveillance for the detection of major storms and weather systems.

Our Weather Bureau has, in the past, given consideration to the establishment of a weather station for both surface and upper air observations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, but the establishment of such a weather station has yet to be accomplished. The exorbitant financial loss suffered by our Government and our private citizens makes it imperative that the Congress act quickly to authorize the establishment of meteorological observation stations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States.

Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation aimed at accomplishing this purpose and the text of my bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to improve the weather forecasting service of the United States, the Administrator of the Environmental Science Services Administration shall take such action as may be necessary to establish a meteorological reporting station of Guadalupe Island, Mexico. In taking such action, he shall cooperate with the State Department and other departments and agencies of the United States, with the meteorological service of Mexico, and with the World Meteorological Organization.

FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS ENGAGED IN TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the 89th Congress I, along with other Members of the House from both political parties, have protested against the self-defeating policy of doing business with foreign-flag vessels which are engaged in trade with North Vietnam. It is exasperating enough to learn that free world trade with North Vietnam has increased about 138 percent since 1955, when the United States first began asking other non-Communist nations to help in exerting economic pressure on that avowed foe of the free world. But it has been downright discouraging to reflect that ships which profited from trade with the United States had a business-as-usual policy with the mortal enemy of American soldiers in Vietnam.

The Department of Commerce has declared that it will deny Government-financed cargoes to foreign-flag vessels which called at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966. Although this certainly is a step in the right direction, I must agree with the presidents of the International Longshoremen's Union, the National Maritime Union, and the Seafarers International Union that the administration's directive blacklisting ships transporting cargoes to North Vietnam is too weak and ineffective.

Following are details of the regulations as they appeared in the Federal Register of February 12, 1966:

The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate U.S. Government departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on information received through February 10, 1966.

Flag of registry, name of ship

	Gross tonnage
British:	
Shienfooon.....	7,127
Shirley Christine.....	6,724
Wakasa Bay.....	7,044
Cypriot: Amon.....	7,229
Greek: Agenor.....	7,139

Sec. 2. Vessels which called at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966, may reacquire eligibility to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States if the persons who control the vessels give satisfactory certification and assurance:

(a) That such vessels will not, thenceforth, be employed in the North Vietnam trade so long as it remains the policy of the U.S. Government to discourage such trade; and

(b) That no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the North Vietnam trade, except as provided in paragraph (c), and

(c) That vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations, including charters, entered into prior to January 25, 1966, requiring their employment in the North Vietnam trade shall be withdrawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.

NICHOLAS JOHNSON,
Maritime Administrator.

VOLUNTARY WAGE GUIDEPOSTS REFUSED BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AND HIS COL- LEAGUES

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House must view with considerable concern the refusal of AFL-CIO President George Meany and his colleagues to accept the voluntary wage guideposts proposed by the Council of Economic Advisers for this year.

The idea of guideposts was first put forward in the 1962 Economic Report of the President. At that time President Kennedy said:

If labor leaders in our major industries will accept the productivity benchmark as a guide to wage objectives, and if management in these industries will practice equivalent restraint in their price decisions, the year ahead will be a brilliant chapter in the record of the responsible exercise of freedom.

Implicit in the late President's remarks was the fear that without this restraint, inflation could nullify whatever economic progress was made. Inflation continues to haunt our economy. With the growing number of people living on fixed incomes in their later years, the danger of inflationary pressures which reduce purchasing power and devalue the dollar is particularly acute. Thus the "productivity benchmark" referred to by President Kennedy must continue to be our standard for wage decisions.

Ideally, we would prefer that Government remain entirely neutral in the decisionmaking process that takes place in the private sector. But we must accept the fact that economic pressure at home and crises around the world demand the careful cooperation of business, labor, and Government.

The proposed guideposts will not guarantee wage-price stability and economic growth, but in my judgment, they represent reasonable standards to guide private decisionmakers in making responsible judgments in the public interest.

The administration should not use these voluntary standards as an excuse for questionable attempts at enforcement. Such recent attempts indicate that we need to review our stockpiling policy. They do not warrant abandonment of the guideposts.

Labor should not set itself above the national interest in sustaining economic growth within a framework of restraint. The times demand responsibility from us all.

A BILL TO INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, two major specters haunt the American people today—fear of a major war in Asia and the threat of widespread inflation.

The sad effects of inflation are especially felt by our senior citizens, most of whom live on fixed incomes either through retirement or on social security. Although the social security check is the same each month, the cost of everything from food to footwear continues to rise at an alarming pace. From 1958 until the most recently enacted increase in social security cash benefits, recipients suffered a 7-percent loss in buying power.

To correct this unfortunate and unnecessary problem, I am introducing a bill today which will provide automatic increases in social security benefits as the cost of living rises. This bill calls for an increase of 3 percent in the benefits whenever the consumer price index reflects a similar jump in the cost of living.

This method alone among the many proposals for improved benefits can be accomplished without any further increase in social security taxes. According to cost studies by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the growth of the economy will provide the necessary revenues to make the cost-of-living adjustments proposed in my bill.

In my opinion this is a just and equitable bill that should be passed. We have an obligation to fulfill to our elderly constituents, for we have created this hydra-headed monster and the responsibility is ours. After all, much of the cause of our present inflation can be directly attributed to the wild spending programs in which our Government is presently engaged.

Inflation, as we all know, means everything costs more.

While prices are spiraling so are the taxes. Social security taxes were boosted with the passage of medicare; excise taxes are being raised back to where they were before and the collection of income taxes is being accelerated. Now the President and his advisers are talking about increasing income taxes even more so that the poor taxpayer is left with less to pay for commodities which cost more.

At the current rate of climb, one-half per cent a month according to the Department of Commerce, the cost of living will go up a highly inflationary 6 percent this year. From the first of last year to the first of this month it rose 4.1 percent, and it looks like it will beat both the Russians and us to the moon. In terms we all understand this means on the average an individual has to lay down \$1.04 on the counter today for what he paid \$1.00 for a little over a year ago, and by the end of this year it will cost a dollar and a dime for what you could get with a dollar last year.

Individual items have jumped more than others: bacon has jumped 61 percent in the last 10 years, a man's wool suit has increased 23 percent in price, and a loaf of bread costs 17 percent more.

Until a more responsible attitude toward government spending is assumed and inflation is stopped, we must do whatever we can to protect those who are hurt the most—the ones living on a fixed income, like our social security folks. I hope Congress acts swiftly and favorably upon my proposal to raise benefits as inflation goes up.

EXPORT SURPLUS OR TRADE DEFICIT?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, since 1960 the Department of Commerce has been announcing an export surplus year after year, ranging from \$4.5 billion to \$6.9 billion. Recently the 1965 trade surplus was given out as amounting to \$5.2 billion. Although this was still at a high level, it was a decline of \$1.7 billion from the high-water mark of \$6.9 billion in 1964.

These high surplus figures have been used both as a measure of the competitive force of our industries in foreign trade and of the great value of exports to our balance of payments deficit. The amounts reported each year have been set against the cost of foreign aid, tourist expenditures abroad, and so forth, to demonstrate the valuable function of exports and their service in offsetting deficits incurred from other sources.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we have been deluding ourselves and singing high notes of optimism when there was little or nothing to be optimistic about, so far as our trade balance and our competitive standing in the world are concerned.

For one thing, our official export statistics have included all the sales and shipments arising from AID appropriations. In other words, our export reports include goods that we ourselves have paid for out of the Treasury. By this measure it would be easy to double our export surplus. We need do no more than increase foreign aid expenditures sufficiently.

Secondly, we have been reporting our imports at what they cost at the foreign point of shipment, neglecting to add freight and insurance costs incurred in bringing the goods to this country. This is a naive practice and we are one of the few countries that adhere to this method. With respect to imports coming from Europe, Asia, and Africa, this understates the cost by some 25 percent. On imports of \$21.3 billion, which was the level of our 1965 purchases abroad on the basis of foreign value, the undervaluation would be serious. The true figure would be closer to \$25 billion.

If we wash out these two unjustifiable practices from our trade statistics, our export surplus vanishes. This is to say, if we value our imports at their true cost and if we exclude from our exports the goods that we sell, not competitively but because we subsidize them or give them away, we actually incurred a deficit of some \$2 billion in 1965 in our foreign trade.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to be gained by deluding ourselves in this manner. On the other hand, much harm can come from such an odd practice. We generally pride ourselves on basing policies on facts, or trying to do so. Otherwise our judgment loses its value.

Why do we then persist in this practice of self-deception? I can think of three reasons that would explain the stubbornness. One is that a large trade surplus would be a great credit to the trade agreements program. It would bear out the predictions made on behalf of the program and the hopes centered in it. It would justify the undertaking by the fruits it had borne.

Not to be overlooked is the reflection that a large export surplus would also put a pleasing sheen on the feverish efforts and motions of the Department of Commerce to promote exports. With no surplus to show for these efforts it might be more difficult to coax more money out of Congress.

The third item is perhaps the most pernicious of the three. The so-called export surplus is used as evidence that the industries of this country are indeed competitive in world markets. Moreover, the high surplus shows that we could absorb further drastic tariff cuts with little risk of damage to our industries.

If the authentic results of our trade demonstrate that we are not really competitive abroad except in two or three products, our trade position takes on a wholly different complexion. The fact is that so far as exports of manufactured goods are concerned we have been experiencing a shrinking in our share compared with other countries. The principal exception is machinery. Our exports of this item have boomed hand in hand with the rising tide of investment of our industries abroad. This may be temporary and may result in shrinking foreign markets for goods shipped from this country in the future. Exports of farm products have also risen to record heights, but this swelling volume is attributable to shipments under Public Law 480, food for peace, and similar programs. They do not reflect an improvement of our competitive position in agricultural products.

It seems unthinkable that under these circumstances we should offer to the world another 50-percent tariff reduction. Recently, Mr. William M. Roth, Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in a speech before the United States-Japan Trade Council, said:

Actually, much has been accomplished so far in Geneva. Items to be excepted from the across-the-board 50-percent cut in industrial tariffs were tabled in November 1964. Our exceptions were kept at the barest mini-

mum consistent with considerations of overriding national security.

Referring to the so-called Kennedy round he also said:

This ambitious effort, the greatest in the 20-year history of GATT trade negotiations, will not fail because of any lack of will or determination of the United States to see it through to a satisfactory conclusion.

So, Mr. Speaker, the policy is to push through the 50-percent reduction in any event. If the facts of our nonexistent trade surplus that have recently come to light do not greatly temper the determination mentioned by Mr. Roth, we can only wonder what is the administration's real attitude toward domestic industry. Is it to be sacrificed willy-nilly because Congress passed the Trade Act over 3 years ago under the false impression that we were riding high in foreign export markets?

I do not believe that we should plunge blindly ahead with further drastic tariff reductions when our trade statistics, if properly reported, would reveal our weak competitive position in world markets.

We would be ill advised, I am convinced, to proceed under the assumption that present high levels of production and employment in this country would justify opening up our market to growing volumes of imports when it is clear that so far as really competitive trade is concerned we are running a deficit. If there is any doubt about this deficit, I think it should be cleared up.

I am joining others who have introduced a joint resolution calling on the Commerce and Treasury Departments to issue summary trade reports that will show our true competitive standing in the world rather than obscuring the facts. I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will hold early hearings so that all doubts can be resolved.

FRED BUSBEY, THE RUGGED INDIVIDUALIST

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to me to learn of the passing of my very good friend, Fred Busbey, who served in this body with distinction in the 78th, 80th, 82d, and 83d Congresses. Inasmuch as he was elected from what is generally known as a politically marginal district, he was not able to have continuity of service and the opportunity to demonstrate his full worth. Notwithstanding this, in each Congress that he served he contributed immeasurably to its deliberations.

We frequently use the descriptive term "rugged individualist" without our always being quite certain what it means. But I think that anyone who was privileged to know Fred Busbey would understand exactly what is meant when we refer to him as a "rugged individualist."

He was a man of convictions, with courage of his convictions, and more than just ordinary courage. He would fight to the bitter end, even if he stood alone, for what he believed. Nothing could deter him.

During World War I, he served as a Regular Army sergeant, and he participated in some of the hardest fought battles of that war. He was proud of this, and justly so. And as I fondly reflect on Fred's service in the Congress, he showed the same ruggedness and determination and ingenuity that somewhat typifies a military sergeant. He did not seek glory for glory's sake. He sought results, and he got results.

With the passing of Fred Busbey I have lost a very fine friend. He will never be forgotten by any of us privileged to know him.

McNENNY FISH HATCHERY AT SPEARFISH, S. DAK.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate to find that the 1967 budget for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife does not include any proposed expenditure for the current building and expansion program being undertaken at the McNenny Fish Hatchery at Spearfish, S. Dak.

The McNenny hatchery, constructed in 1951, produces rainbow and brown trout primarily for stocking waters in the Black Hills trout management area. This area contains about 175 miles of trout streams and 1,900 acres of trout lakes, which provide an estimated 800,000 man-hours of angling annually. In addition to this, this hatchery supplies 17 counties in western South Dakota, 21 counties in western North Dakota, 10 counties in eastern Wyoming, and a large Bureau of Reclamation reservoir in Nebraska. The average annual production of all species is about 70,000 pounds.

During the past several years the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and State and local governments have constructed numerous new impoundments in South Dakota, and the three neighboring States. Many of these reservoirs provide excellent trout fishing; however, to maintain the fishery, frequent planting of fingerling fish is required. Requests for fingerling trout by management agencies exceed the present production capabilities of the hatchery.

The McNenny hatchery also serves as a production test center for the formulation and testing of fish diets. This has resulted in significant improvements in our ability to produce quality diets at substantial cost savings. A new building is needed to house testing and diet formulation equipment, and to provide additional fingerling production facilities. With funds provided in fiscal year 1966—

\$25,000—a well is at the present time being drilled to supplement the hatchery's water supply.

The development program, which I shall outline in a moment, must be undertaken to increase the production of fish and to improve efficiency of operations immediately. The expanded facilities would mean about 100,000 pounds of trout could be produced annually, approximately doubling the present fingerling production.

The development program includes the following items:

Pipeline.....	\$10,000
Broodstock raceways.....	20,000
Production building and facilities.....	120,000
Residence.....	20,000
Sewage disposal system.....	20,000
Equipment.....	15,000

Therefore, the total estimated cost of the program is \$205,000. I urge the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and each Member of this House to carefully consider this building program, and urge that the necessary funds be included in the 1967 fiscal year budget so this important construction program can continue without interruption.

FEDERAL REVENUES FOR USE IN STATE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining several of my Republican colleagues in introducing legislation to share a portion of Federal revenues with each State for use in public elementary and secondary education.

The bill would establish an educational assistance trust fund, into which 1 percent of the revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule would be deposited the first year, 2 percent the second year, up to 5 percent the fifth year, and thereafter.

Tax sharing for education is based on a two-part formula: half of the money would be returned to the States on a per-student basis; the other half would be based on the amount of effort each State is currently putting into education. "Effort" is defined as the percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education.

The concept of tax sharing to bolster the State's abilities to provide those services which are within its domain is an attractive one to all those who fear intervention by Washington in local matters. Education, along with other services, is becoming more and more difficult for States to afford. State taxes have risen steadily, from \$4.9 billion 20 years ago to \$24.2 billion in 1964. In 1963 alone, property taxes rose 7.3 percent over 1962 rates, sales taxes increased by 8.7 percent, corporation taxes by 7.5

percent, and personal income tax by 6.3 percent.

All this has been caused by the increase in State and local expenditures. These have risen by 600 percent since the mid-1940's. The cost of education alone has risen over 700 percent in that time, from \$3 billion in 1946 to \$22 billion. And this outlay for education is expected to double by 1972.

State and local taxes have risen about as high as they can go, with the Federal Government preempting so much of the national income through Federal income tax. This leaves State and local governments in the position of having no place to turn except to the Federal Government.

However, the knowledge of local situations, needs, and problems is at the local and State level. They are far better able to improve their educational programs themselves. Gigantic Federal programs too often result in Federal control and the imposition of rules which are not in the best interests of education in all areas.

This year we have seen several localities in the United States refuse aid under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because they feared overcontrol by the Office of Education. They would rather struggle along in freedom than lose control of the education of their children to those in far-removed offices in Washington.

For experience has taught us that Federal subsidy brings Federal control. The tax-sharing plan, however, lets the Federal Government provide the funds and lets the States determine how these can best be used to supplement their own efforts.

Built into the formula is the assurance that no State will then decide to sit back and let Uncle Sam pay the bills, for the amount a State receives depends in great part upon its own per student expenditures. If anything, this will spur the States on to greater effort.

To assure that the money is spent for education, plans will be submitted by the Governor to the Comptroller General of the United States each year, and at the end of the year an audit must be submitted to show actual use. This approach gives a tremendous boost to the education of our young people. Per pupil expenditures can increase greatly through Federal contributions and at the same time, incentive will be provided for each State to make even more effort on its own.

There would be no need for a great expansion of Federal personnel in Washington to administer the program—it would be handled by the local officials already on the job. It would yield us the greatest return on our investment, for it would utilize the best capabilities of each level of government.

Our federal system is a precious freedom which we must strive to preserve and strengthen. It is built firmly upon the Federal-State cooperation and division of powers and responsibilities, such as I propose in this bill. And like every other precious thing we know in America, its strength is in the education of each new generation to carry it on and

protect it. Surely, then, we can make no wiser investment in our Nation's future than by the speedy passage of this bill.

ROTATION NOW IN VIETNAM

Mr. SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that from thinly populated Wyoming, with less than 320,000 human beings, six families have been called upon to pay the supreme price of the escalation of our Vietnam military posture.

These six fatalities are:

First. Alma Jack Stumpp, Afton, Wyo.

Second. Ernest Taylor, Jr., Kaycee, Wyo.

Third. Robert Fred Guthrie, Cheyenne, Wyo.

Fourth. Craig Blackner, Lyman, Wyo.

Fifth. Sam Lee Delos, Ten Sleep, Wyo.

Sixth. Ladd Condy, Cheyenne, Wyo.

What is particularly tragic, Mr. Speaker, is that in the case of at least two of the above war casualties from Wyoming had there been some type of rotation policy in effect in Vietnam their lives might have been spared.

Mr. Guthrie, a young man from Cheyenne, Wyo., was killed within 30 days prior to the completion of his tour of duty—after a 4-year hitch as a corpsman in the U.S. Marines.

On November 17, 1965, Ernest E. Taylor—a specialist 4th class—from Kaycee, Wyo., was killed in action. Two days before, he had written to friends that he expected to be released from combat duty on December 10 to begin his trip home, following his stretch of duty. In this case he was killed less than 3 weeks prior to the completion of his tour.

These two deaths show again the necessity for a review now of the military policy that asks far too much of a few while far too many get by giving far too little in this process of defending America in time of its military engagements.

Because of my own personal experience in the 1st Infantry Division in World War II, Mr. Speaker, an American Regular Army Division again engaged in combat in Vietnam—I believe it is proper to call to the attention of my colleagues at this time this glaring inequity in the Armed Forces of the United States. I have, accordingly, written to the Secretary of Defense suggesting a rotation policy for men in combat, and if none is forthcoming, I shall introduce legislation to that effect.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that these conflicts in policing the world—and particularly our Vietnam commitment—may extend for a long period of time. This being true, a certain number of set days in combat or "in contact with the enemy," becomes the only real goal which a fighting man understands in carrying out the daily ordeals of combat.

We in the Halls of Congress, we in the safe, well-fed sectors of America, may be moved by the euphonious principles daily restated in these difficult times. But to men eating the C-rations and sleeping in swamps, to men digging holes in the jun-

gle and fighting and dying—so many days in combat and then home—this is the only language they truly understand.

A man in combat feels one thing above all else—and that is that he stays alive in order to come home to his loved ones. If a rotation policy is in effect, he is a better soldier because of it. If one is not in effect, Mr. Speaker, he has no goal; he has only bleakness and a constantly doubtful moral factor at best, which will always affect his proficiency.

I stress again, Mr. Speaker, experience has taught us that the first thing for which any man fights is his self-preservation. I believe we had better establish a firm and definite policy of rotation for our great fighting men now. It should be so many days in combat, during all of which they may look forward to returning home. Thus somebody in the training camps or civilian life in America, can take their place to carry on the fight which means so much to so many.

I believe a strong immediate rotation policy should be placed in effect so that at least five riflemen with the most overseas duty per company per month should be rotated home and replaced with recruits from stateside.

I believe these five men should come from every combat unit in South Vietnam, and I believe that at least two men should be rotated home from all support, supply, and other noncombat units now in these theaters of operations.

Mr. Speaker, I stress that this is a matter of equity and of the basic concepts of justice—and I hope my colleagues will take an interest in this vital matter.

In World War II in the Big Red One—the 1st Division—it was said that there were two ways to get home, by rotation or in a pine box—in a mattress cover, to be exact. In my sparsely populated district, which is the State of Wyoming, Mr. Speaker, six young men have come home so far via a pine box. It is time now to assure that the next six to come home to Wyoming come home alive and well, and able to know the respect and admiration of a grateful people.

THE WAR THAT FOREIGN AID FIGHTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am told by those who have visited the battlefronts in South Vietnam that average life expectancy in Vietnam is only 35 years. You may be surprised to learn, however, that this figure has nothing to do with the bullets of the Communist enemy. This figure is the result of the ravages of other enemies: disease, hunger, and ignorance. The United States is engaged in a war on these killers as well as the terror and death spread by the Vietcong.

The soldiers on this second front are the teams of doctors being trained with the help of U.S. medical personnel and equipment provided through our AID program. Medical centers in Hue and Saigon are now graduating 150 doctors a year to take charge of the country's expanding medical services. More than 12,000 health centers have been established and stocked with medicines in rural health programs manned by 8,000 newly trained village health workers. When the United States started its battle against disease and squalor in Vietnam, there were fewer than 200 civilian doctors attending to the medical needs of 16 million people.

The importance of this effort is not diminished by the fact that Vietcong guerrillas destroy some of the new health units as soon as they are constructed. In every village where a Government health center is caring for the sick and undernourished there is visible proof of which side is concerned with the welfare of the people, proof which the Vietcong seek to obliterate.

The AID-supported health program started with the introduction of sanitary water supplies in the ancient capital of Hue, as well as in Saigon. In rural areas, outdoor sanitary facilities have been added.

A major campaign against malaria which was initiated with the help of U.S.-trained malaria teams, has reduced the incidence of new cases to less than 2 percent a year.

Deaths from malaria have been reduced from 35,000 in 1958 to 2,000 in 1965. Seven million people have been vaccinated against cholera, and 8 million more have received vaccinations and treatments for other diseases.

American civilians are responding increasingly to the Vietnamese Government's call for medical help. The latest group of American doctors to volunteer their services in Vietnam included 30 Cuban refugees. One hundred personnel from the U.S. Army Medical Civilian Action Program are also serving.

While there are many inadequacies and shortcomings in our AID program in Vietnam, there is no questions but that this humanitarian effort equals or exceeds in importance our military effort there. The Agency and the administration are now making a major effort to win the nonmilitary war in Vietnam—and are successfully persuading the South Vietnamese Government to place more emphasis in this direction. This effort as fully deserves our support as the military authorization on which we will shortly be acting.

SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS HELP

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which

must be passed if the small businessmen of this Nation are to receive the assistance the Congress intends they receive. My bill would separate the revolving funds under the Small Business Act so that the Small Business Administration could not reach into direct business loan funds even if some widespread disaster would justify that action. In the case of a disaster requiring additional financial assistance from SBA, a separate supplemental appropriation would be required. The thrust of this bill is to keep inviolate the small business direct loan program which has been so important to the small businessmen of the Nation.

The legislation I have introduced would not increase the SBA appropriation but would divide it into three separate revolving funds reserved for specific purposes. The Small Business Act now provides for only one with allocations set administratively within SBA.

My bill would establish one revolving fund for direct business loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, prime contract authority under section 8(a), and loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the amount of \$1 billion.

A second revolving fund totaling \$300 million is set up for disaster loans under section 7(b) and section 7(b)(2). The third separate revolving fund is set up for programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958—except for title IV of that act—and the bill authorizes \$461 million for this fund.

My bill also sets limits for the amounts of loans, guarantees and commitments which may be outstanding at any one time under each of the three funds.

Mr. Speaker, the need for legislation such as I have introduced today has been amply demonstrated on a number of occasions in recent years. The recent transit strike in New York City dramatized the seriousness of the failure of the Small Business Administration to seek funds necessary to maintain an effective direct loan program. Congress must take immediate action to provide these funds.

Although SBA suspended its direct loan last October 11, it took no steps to obtain sufficient funds to avert economic disaster should an emergency arise. When the transit strike became an extended emergency, thousands of small businessmen were faced with economic ruin and SBA had no resources to assist them. Instead, SBA was forced to hastily round up extra funds to provide direct loans. There is some question whether the \$20 million SBA raised from a revolving fund was enough to meet the need. But the main point is that SBA's mad dash for money was precisely the wrong approach and should not have been necessary.

Suspension of the direct loan program is now in its sixth month and SBA officials still are unable to tell us when they will be able to lift the moratorium. True, SBA is studying ways of better organizing the loan program, but that is little comfort to the businessman who needs a loan now.

I urge all my colleagues to join with me in taking positive action to put the

small business direct loan program back on its feet. We can afford no further delay.

ESTONIA—INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to extend congratulations to the thousands of supporters in America of Estonian independence and to the captive people of Estonia on this February 24, the anniversary of their independence. While the Estonian nation has experienced many misfortunes since their 1918 declaration of independence, the ebullient quest for freedom and liberty that was once achieved, remains strong today.

Yes, Russia still wields its overpowering influence in Estonia, but even 22 consecutive years of Russian occupation have not succeeded in destroying the Estonians' determination to remain true to their own cultural heritage.

The shameful and sometimes barbaric treatment of the people of Estonia at the hands of the Russian Communists is surpassed perhaps only by that of Nazi Germany. Proof of Russian brutality and virtual extermination of much of Estonia's people lies in the stark population statistics of 1934 and 1959. During that 25-year interval the Estonian population decreased by approximately 120,000. Primary methods employed by the Soviets which account for those losses were purges, deportations, and murders. Many Estonians were forced to become refugees, many of whom were able to come to America. But this policy of the Russians had another facet; the number of Russians in Estonia grew by more than 167,000 during the same period. It is estimated that more than 240,000 persons from the Soviet Union have "migrated" into Estonia. We are all aware that the purpose of this Russian program was to dilute Estonian nationalism through a tremendous influx of persons loyal to Mother Russia. However, strong Estonian resistance to this imperialist Russian subterfuge has been a leading factor in its failure and is quite reminiscent of the historic failures during the 1721-1918 period of czarist Russian occupation.

Americans of Estonian descent have continued their activities in support of liberty for their captured brethren. America can take pride in the fact that she has welcomed to her shores more than 60,000 Estonian refugees from Nazi and Communist persecution. Though naturally concerned about events in Estonia, these Estonian-Americans have freely joined in the fight to improve man's condition wherever he is found.

While much of the world's attention has been focused on such vital issues as Vietnam and proliferation of nuclear weapons, we must not lose sight of the

plain and overriding issue of fundamental human freedom. The people of Estonia are unfortunate victims who bear witness to the fact that the struggle for freedom is not limited to the "undeveloped" areas of the world. It is being carried out wherever one group of people uses force or intimidation to subject another group to its will. It is in this light we should consider the case of Estonia.

It is a travesty of the meaning of freedom that these people must be forced to observe the passing of another anniversary while in the cruel and vise-like grasp of Communist Russia. Let us in everyway possible and at every opportunity call to the world's attention the plight of the people of Estonia and the rest of the souls Communist Russia still maintains in virtual bondage.

VASCO DE SOUSA JARDIM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening in my hometown of Newark I was privileged to join with many of my friends in the community in paying tribute to one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, Vasco de Sousa Jardim. Founder, editor, publisher of New Jersey's weekly Portuguese language newspaper, Vasco Jardim's influence extends well beyond New Jersey and well beyond his ethnic associations. And for his more than 40 years of service to the community and to his fellow Portuguese-Americans, Vasco Jardim was singled out to receive the highest civilian honor that can be awarded by the Government of Portugal: Conferral of the Order of Prince Henry.

It was a joyous occasion, this dinner, and I was honored myself by being asked to participate in the events. His Excellency Vasco Viera Garin, Ambassador of Portugal to the United States, made the presentation to Mr. Jardim, while such leading figures within the Portuguese-American community as Father Jose L. Capote; Father Anthony Monteiro; Donald B. Gomes, the chairman; Frank Soares, cochairman; Dr. Manuel L. da Silva, toastmaster; Antonio Braga, recording secretary; Mrs. Daniel Rodrigues, corresponding secretary; and Mario Teixeira, Jr., treasurer, were responsible for the well-organized success of the entire affair.

Vasco Jardim typifies the great men who have made America great since our early days. Born in the Madeira Islands of Portugal, he came to this country in 1920, settled and married in one of the largest Portuguese-American communities in southwestern Massachusetts, moving to Newark in 1928. Even as in Fall River and New Bedford, Vasco Jardim immediately became a powerful force for good in his new community.

As a reporter, he was always aware of his responsibility for truth; as a citizen, he helped weld into the community those of his own ethnic heritage and helped the community to wipe away the artificial barriers that are often set around ethnic groups.

Many years ago John Donne wrote:

No man is an island sufficient unto itself.

Each of us is touched, each of us is affected and changed, for better or for worse, by the actions of others. Because this is true, all of Newark, all of New Jersey and so many communities beyond our State lines stand in the debt of the man we honored last Saturday evening.

Good deeds are as the stars which shine brightly in the dark sky of night. We do not notice them in the sun-filled glare of day-to-day living; but they are there, nevertheless, to brighten the world at an hour when it most needs brightening. Saturday night we paid tribute publicly to one who so has brightened the world; to one who has given so much without reckoning the cost; to one who has labored so valiantly without regard for reward.

Vasco Jardim has made the world a little richer, a little warmer and a much, much better place for all of us. To which we can only add our sincere and heartfelt thanks and our prayers that he will long continue to do so.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I consider the setting aside today of our legislative duties for a few moments to recognize Estonia's independence anniversary as being a fitting tribute to the Estonian people. And yet, as I offer my congratulations to Estonia and to her many friends here in America, the occasion leaves me with mixed emotions. First, I am very privileged and grateful to wish Estonia well, but at the same time I am saddened when I reflect on the suffering and sacrifice that country has had to endure only to find itself still under the heel of Soviet Russia.

Estonia is a proud land. She endured almost 200 consecutive years of czarist domination before she achieved her independence on February 24, 1918. However, in spite of that fact, her nationalist fervor took root and culminated in the country's becoming independent in 1918. Ridding one's country of foreign troops almost singlehandedly is not an easy thing to do. And in addition, Estonia had to fight German troops on one front while repelling Russian forces on another.

While attempting to solidify their newly won independence, the Estonians quickly discovered that running an independent state is not a simple matter. But the people eagerly joined in and the

battle for domestic progress and stability was joined.

Soviet Russia had no intention of permitting that attempt at democracy so close to its borders to succeed, and merely awaited an opportunity to quash the Estonian Government. That opportunity was provided through the fanaticism of Hitler and World War II. Through heinous, brutal, and illegal methods, Russia gained control of the country in 1940, and resumed that control in 1944. Tragically, that control exists today.

Free men and women must determine how much longer that situation will exist. We must accept our responsibilities and play our roles, no matter how small or large, and examine Russia's imperialistic relationship with Estonia.

As we join in wishing congratulations on the anniversary of Estonian independence, let us try to make that event a living reality once again.

REV. GAETANO RUGGIERO

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week the city of Newark was saddened by the passing of one of its outstanding citizens and spiritual leaders, the Reverend Gaetano Ruggiero. Father Ruggiero's loss is a deep sorrow to the thousands of us who knew him, and the parishioners of St. Lucy's Church, which he served as pastor for almost 34 years, will long miss his kind and inspiring guidance and leadership. But we can take solace in remembering the many years during which we were blessed by his work among us. Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD at this point an editorial and a column by Vince Tuzzolo from the Italian Tribune of February 18, 1966, which eloquently express what we all feel about Father Ruggiero:

[From the Italian Tribune, Feb. 18, 1966]

REV. GAETANO RUGGIERO

Those of us who were privileged to know and love Rev. Gaetano Ruggiero, and there are many, were saddened this week by his death.

He was first of all a dedicated priest and the beloved pastor of St. Lucy's Church for more than 33 years. But he was more—much more. Sincere, friend, spiritual adviser, family counselor, you could call him all of these and still not capture with words his personal magnetism and momentous achievements.

He exemplified the qualities that have elevated the standards of our community to the high plane on which it is firmly established.

Our only comfort is that he has joined Almighty God whom he served so well for so long.

His mortal remains are buried on the grounds of St. Lucy's Church. His spirit will live on.

[From the Italian Tribune, Feb. 18, 1966]

FATHER RUGGIERO

The passing of Rev. Gaetano Ruggiero, beloved pastor of St. Lucy's Church has left

a void in the hearts of the thousands of parishioners who over the years have occupied pews and sat attentively as the good padre read the gospel or delivered a meaningful sermon with purpose. That they will miss the likeable little priest, who won his way into the hearts of many and succeeded to earn the respect and admiration of the most hardened parishioners goes without saying.

A deeply dedicated man of the cloth, Father Ruggiero, was best known for his warmth and understanding, qualities which were reflected in his ready smile and mirrored in the sparkle of his eyes. Much like the shepherd who led his flock, Father Ruggiero, was a stalwart leader who stood as a guiding influence among the people of the parish. Testimony to his talents are the many successful accomplishments during his pastorate. The completion of the church, the erection and decoration of the Chapel of St. Gerard Shrine and the new rectory along with the St. Lucy's Community Center. His last act was the signing of a contract for the installation of air conditioning in the church.

It can also be said that Reverend Ruggiero was proud of the St. Lucy's Bugle and Drum Corps, national champions and winner of many titles and competitions. It might also be added he was somewhat delighted over the championships garnered by the St. Lucy baseball teams. Although, never known to be athletically inclined, Father Ruggiero was an advocate for good clean athletic and recreational participation. He viewed this form of exercise as a healthy outlet for the abundant energies stored up in the bodies of our young. Although he often added as an afterthought, "they are less likely to get into mischief."

There is much that can be said of this humble, kind man, whose career spanned more than 50 years in the priesthood. He studied at the Acreale Seminary in Sicily and attended the Gregorian University in Rome where he earned his bachelor of divinity and doctor of canon law.

He came onto St. Lucy's in the year of 1932 as pastor to succeed the late Msgr. Joseph Perotti. He completed much of the work started by the late Monsignor while realizing many of his own initiated programs.

Man and boy, the writer had known Father Ruggiero for many years, first as a parishioner and in the years to follow as a follower and supporter of his many projects.

He was blessed with a great retentive memory and knew the faces and names of almost all the parishioners and their offsprings. We will still remember the events of our first meeting and introduction. "Tuzzolo," he had said, "yes, you are the son of Theodora." My mother was a deeply religious woman. In fact, we daresay she was in church more than she was home.

The moments we recall best of Father Ruggiero are those in which we found him in his office at the rectory. At his desk, writing a letter and on other occasions immersed in deep meditation. There were other times when, listening to his stereo, he was carried away by some familiar aria and hummed along with the tune. He loved music and some of his leisure hours were spent listening to the classics. He knew practically every score of all the operas.

Then there was the time early last year when the writer, in company with Anthony Coppola, called on the Father to tell him he had been selected for the Tribune Award as the "Outstanding Citizen." His first reaction was one of surprise. Then, recovering from this unlooked for event, he turned to us and said, "While I am deeply grateful for this honor I am sure there are many others more deserving." Father advised us to look elsewhere for someone else. However, we assured him we would not take no for an answer, as this was the decision of the awards committee.

Out of respect for him we conceded to give him time to think it over, stating that his acceptance would in a large sense do us honor. We were happy to find on our next visit several weeks later he was to give his consent.

There are countless things we remember of this wonderful little priest, whose wise counsel and spiritual guidance enriched the lives of the many of us who had the benefit of his teachings. Requiescat in pace.

NEWARK 300

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening an ambitious, resourceful and challenging project was unveiled to commemorate my hometown's tercentenary. Under the directorship of Thomas C. Murray, a teacher at Essex Catholic High School, the students of the high school put together a topical review of Newark's 300 years.

Even if I had not been a lifelong resident of Newark, I would still have been pleased and favorably impressed by the scope and thoroughness of the student's work. "Newark 300" gives deserved attention and new dimension to the many and varied roles which our city has played through 3 eventful centuries of history—from the hazards and hardships of early colonial life to the search for values and individual identity at the dawn of the space age.

A bustling community, rich in culture and tradition long before the Declaration of Independence, Newark retained its early pioneering spirit as its driving force through years of growth and greatness as it became a leader in manufacturing, commerce, banking, and transportation, and an important contributor to the cultural enrichment of the Nation.

It is always fascinating to poke among the burned-out ashes of yesterday's fires the peek behind the curtained cobwebs of the past. We find so much to stir our fancy, so much to cause us to reflect.

No one knows this better than Miss Miriam Studley, the inspired director of the New Jersey Room of Newark's Public Library. Wisely enough, the students of Essex Catholic dedicated the book they they compiled on Newark's history to Miss Studley, for she was genuinely deserving of this tribute.

When skillfully applied, the lessons of the past help us to understand the present that we may build a better future. With this in mind, I suggested that this anniversary salute be dedicated to the Newark of tomorrow.

Three hundred years have taken their toll. Blight has crept into older neighborhoods. Some buildings have deteriorated beyond repair and usefulness. Narrow horse-and-buggy streets need to be widened to accommodate modern vehicles.

The Federal Government has recognized its responsibility to help the big

cities solve the problems induced by age and urbanization. And Congress has been accelerating programs of Federal aid for vitally needed renewal projects, for new housing, for new roads, for replacement of outworn municipal equipment.

Newark has been getting its fair share of Federal aid. Wherever one looks in Newark today, one is heartened by the sight of new construction rising on locations where eyesores recently festered. The facelifting is going well. The tell-tale wrinkles of old age are being smoothed over, and a new, young Newark can confidently look ahead to a promising future of gracious growth—economically, socially, culturally.

"Newark 300," its director, Thomas C. Murray, its creators, the students of Essex Catholic High School deserve the thanks, the praise of all Newark citizens for their singular contribution to understanding our past, planning our future.

TO IMPROVE AND UPDATE THE FEDERAL-STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 13037, designed to improve and update the Federal-State Employment Services, and to make them into the kind of institution which these times demand. A similar bill has been introduced in the other body by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. The Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, and the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the other body, chaired by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, have planned joint hearings to begin on or about March 1. It is our hope that these hearings, the hearings that have been held on Employment Service and Manpower Problems by our two subcommittees in the recent past and the report of the Secretary of Labor's Task Force on the Employment Service will provide a record on which the Congress can, this year, move to meet the growing needs in this area.

The bill which I have introduced today does not, let me assure you, seek to create a monolithic, federalized, public employment service which will try to, or be able to, swallow up the private employment services. Let that tired old charge be laid to rest right now.

On the contrary, this bill will not only strengthen the Federal and the State manpower services, but empowers the Secretary of Labor to cooperate actively with the private employment services, as well as with other public agencies and private groups which may be able to

serve the goal which all those interested in the manpower problem seek to reach—a state of affairs in which job openings are widely publicized, in which qualified workers are available to meet industry's needs, and in which the new techniques of information exchange are placed at the disposal of the entire manpower services profession—public and private, State, and Federal.

This great Nation's human resources, Mr. Speaker, are the real cornerstone of our national strength. These resources are rich and they are varied, but the demands upon them are growing as rapidly as human ingenuity can devise new products, new skills, and new ways of doing things.

In times past, people have commented on the tragic irony of starvation in one area and food surpluses in another. An equally tragic irony is the fact of labor shortages in one part of our economy and unemployment in another. If we are to see our manpower resources used wisely, if the age of automation is to be, as indeed it can be, an age in which the benefits of technology are to be placed at the service of human beings, we need an active national manpower policy. And if we are to have such a policy, we need the tools to shape and carry out such a policy.

The Manpower Services System which this bill seeks to create is one of those tools. I hope the Congress will consider it, will shape it further to meet our national manpower needs, and make it available to the American people.

LEGISLATION TO INSURE SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to insure that the special school milk program is extended with an adequate appropriation to assure the continued availability of milk at a moderate price for consumption in our Nation's schools.

I was concerned with the earlier action of the Budget Bureau in refusing to release \$3 million already appropriated for the special school milk program this year, and I am deeply disturbed by the proposal to cut funds for the school lunch program by 12 percent and the special milk program by almost 80 percent for the coming fiscal year.

These programs have through the years proven to be especially effective means of assisting schools in providing nutritionally desirable diets to grade and high school students at moderate prices. I feel they have in this important manner contributed to the health and development of the Nation's future generation.

During fiscal year 1964 nearly 60 million school lunches and over 50 million additional half-pints of milk were served

to students in the State of Iowa alone under these extremely successful and popular programs. I have personally visited in 68 schools in northeast Iowa this fall, and have eaten with students in their cafeterias. I know how valuable the programs are to the overall education effort in the State.

I can see no need to reduce these successful programs which cost relatively little and have provided enormous nutritional benefits for the Nation's students at the same time that new and unproven proposals are receiving additional funds. Moreover, the effect of these cuts is almost certain to impose further strain upon already overburdened property taxes and local school budgets, as well as to increase the cost of milk to our schoolchildren.

It is, of course, extremely important to closely review all programs of Government to avoid unnecessary expenditures. I am afraid, however, that when the unquestioned benefits of providing proper nutritional advantages for so many of the Nation's students is weighed against the comparatively small cost of the program, the proposed reductions may prove to be unwise economy.

I sincerely hope that hearings will be held on this legislation at an early date by the appropriate committees of Congress, and that the benefits of the programs will be extended.

LEGAL AID FOR INDIGENTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, recent news accounts disclose that David G. Bress, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, has rejected a proposal to provide indigent suspects with lawyers during stationhouse interrogations by the police. Washington Post, February 15, 1966. The proposal was submitted by the neighborhood legal service project, which is part of the war on poverty program in the District. The suggested stationhouse legal aid program would have been manned by the project's staff attorneys and volunteers from the local bar associations. At a time when the resources of this Nation are being mobilized to help the poor, it is most disturbing that the U.S. Attorney in the Nation's Capital should not allow legal assistance to be made available to indigent suspects in the stationhouse.

At issue here is the question of the point at which a criminal suspect becomes entitled to legal assistance, and whether the indigent suspect may be denied the opportunity for legal assistance at the stationhouse which the wealthy suspect is able to obtain.

It is difficult to understand why the U.S. attorney would turn down an offer to provide such legal aid to indigents. Apparently the Federal Government's policy of encouraging legal help to the

poor is not fully understood—in any event, it is not being fully effectuated.

Apparently one of the reasons the U.S. attorney rejected the proposed offer of legal aid at this time is that he desires to await the outcome of five cases pending before the Supreme Court which raise many questions concerning a suspect's rights in the interrogation stage a criminal case. The pending cases are: *California v. Stewart*, No. 584; *Miranda v. Arizona*, No. 759; *Vignera v. New York*, No. 760; *Westover v. U.S.*, No. 761; *Johnson v. New Jersey*, No. 762.

These cases reflect the split among the lower courts over the scope in the Supreme Court's holding in *Escobedo v. Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478, June 1964, where the Court reversed a murder conviction because Escobedo had confessed after the police refused to let him see his lawyer, who was in the stationhouse at the time, asking to see Escobedo. In effect, the Court held that the fifth amendment's privilege against self-incrimination and the sixth amendment's guarantee of defense counsel do extend to the police station. No one can predict with certainty as to how much the Escobedo decision will be clarified by the Court in the pending cases. However, it is virtually certain that the Court will resolve the issue which splits lower courts around the country today. That is, whether the police must advise a prime suspect of his right to remain silent and his right to a lawyer before eliciting a confession from him.

Of course, it is necessary to emphasize that where law enforcement officials have not yet "focused" on a particular suspect, they remain free and unhampered to investigate criminal cases by gathering information and evidence from witnesses without applying the strict ruling of Escobedo.

If the Court holds that the police have no such obligation, the Escobedo decision will have then been limited to the peculiar facts in that case. Rarely do lawyers appear in the precinct house while a suspect is being questioned. Nor are many suspects worldly enough or financially able to afford an attorney. However, it would be difficult for the Court to limit the Escobedo decision to only those situations where a suspect's attorney is already present at the stationhouse and the suspect specifically requests to see him.

For, as the Court there stated:

Nothing we have said today affects the powers of the police to investigate "an unsolved crime," by gathering information from witnesses and by other "proper investigative efforts." We hold only that when the process shifts from investigatory to accusatory—when its focus is on the accused and its purpose is to elicit a confession—our adversary system begins to operate, and, under the circumstances here, the accused must be permitted to consult with his lawyer.

Meanwhile, it would be appropriate for U.S. law enforcement officials not to worsen the existing plight of indigent accused persons by declining to permit them to have legal assistance. The offer of the neighborhood legal service project of stationhouse legal aid provided a singular opportunity for the U.S. at-

torney in the District of Columbia to assume a role of national leadership with respect to protecting legal rights of accused persons.

It is to be regretted that a more affirmative response was not forthcoming.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker—

The news may be good or bad—we shall tell you the truth.

These words were spoken in the first broadcast of the Voice of America, in February 1942.

With these words, America embraced a mighty principle, a principle which should be our eternal guide.

The agency, in a recent booklet, explained itself in lean, admirable prose.

It said:

The Voice of America speaks to the world for America, for the Government, and for the people of the United States. It seeks to make U.S. policies intelligible. It seeks to inform. It attempts to associate the people of the United States, in their daily lives, their progress and their yearnings, with the legitimate aspirations of all people everywhere.

In my judgment, the Voice of America is effective in direct proportion to its candor and objectivity. When it is candid, when it is objective, when it reports a diversity of opinion, it is doing its job. When these elements are missing, its effectiveness is bound to decline.

If the Voice is to be listened to—it must get through. The former obstacle of jamming has disappeared in Eastern Europe, for example, except for Bulgaria. But you must attract and hold listeners in the face of radio competition from friends and adversaries. You do this by programing, packaging, and credibility. Basically, you must be listened to, and you must be respected. The interrelationship is a persistent one.

The Voice of America speaks the language of truth in 37 of the world's languages. Every day, an audience of tens of millions is reached directly in those 37 languages. In addition, 28 other languages are used for special programs. Incidentally, we broadcast more hours in "Worldwide English" than any other language.

The raw statistics of the Voice of America operation are impressive.

Packaged programs, totaling 13,000 hours are placed each week on local stations abroad.

The Voice has 100 transmitters, 56 of them overseas. This insures clear transmission in most of the world.

The Voice broadcasts close to 800 hours weekly. This compares to the U.S.S.R.'s 1,350, Red China's 900, the United Kingdom's 630, and the United Arab Republic's 580. I trust that we make up in quality any deficit in quantity.

The budget for USIA's radio arm for fiscal year 1966 is \$30.1 million.

Voice of America news editors transmit about 50,000 words of news every day. Special material is also prepared for individual countries.

There has been a revolution in communications in the 24 years since the Voice of America was born. The mass production of transistor radios, for example, has dramatically enlarged the potential listening audience. Over the years, the Voice has adapted well, for the most part, both in personnel and equipment.

I had the good fortune to become personally acquainted with the Voice in early 1962, when the distinguished Edward R. Murrow, as head of USIA, was carrying the Agency to new highs of professional pride. Since that time I have cut nearly 125 tapes for transmission to Eastern Europe.

I have found the top leadership of the Voice, including the desk officers, to be highly skilled and dedicated men. They do not tire of learning more and more about countries they are broadcasting to, while keeping fully apprised about America. Moreover, the practice of interlacing Foreign Service officers into the Voice's administrative machinery brings fresh men and fresh viewpoints into play. John Chancellor, the new director, is the first professional radio-man to head the Voice. The appointment of this highly respected newsman emphasizes the importance of the Agency.

A few weeks ago, I was privileged to be a member of the congressional delegation which took part in the dedication of a new hospital in Krakow, Poland, a hospital built, in part, with counterpart funds.

Although the Polish press did not carry any coverage of the dedication until after the event, we found that the man on the street was well informed—thanks to the Voice of America—about both the hospital and about our delegation.

I had a personal experience which added deeply to my impression that the Voice has a wide audience in Poland. While in Krakow, I was called out of a dinner and informed that a shy young man was asking for me. It turned out to be my first cousin. He had learned from his village priest, who had heard the news on Voice of America, that I was a member of the delegation. Whereupon he had traveled all night on a train, hundreds of kilometers, and slept in a train station, to greet his American relative. It was a moving personal experience.

While I have had occasion to be more familiar with the Voice of America's European activities, I know of its increasing emphasis on Latin America, Asia, and Africa. A free flow of information to these continents is in our interest, in the short run and in the long run.

The Voice must resist the temptation to color its news summaries and interpretations for short-run advantages.

Understandably, there have been and there may continue to be such temptations when crisis situations erupt.

We in the Congress must resist similar temptations. In exercising our supervisory responsibilities, we can best serve our Nation in 1966 by holding the Voice to the high purposes it began with in 1942:

The news may be good or bad—but we will tell you the truth.

ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, by speeches, programs, awards, and other activities we in America today offer our recognition of Estonia's 48th anniversary. I am very proud that we have continued to offer our support and encouragement to those millions of brave people in Estonia who are held in captivity by Moscow.

Historically, however, Russian domination in Estonia has not been a new phenomenon. From 1721 to 1918, the tiny nation had been held in subjugation by czarist Russia, which had expected much effort to make the Estonian people "russified." Though suffering death, deportation, hunger, and other deprivations at the hands of Russia, the strong ties to her cultural past have sustained Estonia in resisting cultural incursions by the Soviets.

The declaration of independence of February 24, 1918, was one of the great landmarks in Estonian history, but brave and courageous deeds have been a common occurrence in that country. Therefore, I hope that as we in this country offer our congratulations to the anniversary of that February 24 event, we will pledge ourselves to stand ever ready to assist Estonia in whatever way we can in order to break Russia's stranglehold on the Estonian nation. These heroic and gallant people certainly deserve a better fate than that forced upon them by Communist Russia.

THE TAX MEASURE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I support the tax measure we voted upon. It will accelerate the rate at which taxes are paid into the Treasury. And it will reimpose excise taxes on telephones and

automobiles which we voted to remove last year, when we did not believe the demands of the conflict in Vietnam would be so great.

I support the tax measure because it is a necessary step to avoid inflation. It follows the monetary policies of the Federal Reserve System, shown in sales of Government bonds and the increase in interest rates.

But I fear the tax measure is not enough to do the job: The projected deficit is up. Unemployment is less than 4 percent, and the unemployed are, by and large, not possessed of the skills which are in demand. Thus, the unemployment rate among those who have skills needed is much less than 4 percent. Plants are operating in excess of 90 percent of capacity. Our balance of payments continues unfavorable. Commodity and consumer price indexes continue to move upward.

Our Nation is committed to a major effort to prevent southeast Asia from becoming dominated by China. At this time, large sums are required for our military operations, and increasingly large sums will be required for our development programs, designed to bring civil peace to areas secured by military operations.

We expect discipline and sacrifice of those who bear the battle. We should demand no less of ourselves at home. This is why we cannot permit inflation to occur, for it is incompatible without responsibilities.

The alternative to vigorous monetary and tax policy to avoid inflation is the imposition of price controls. As we know from past experience, price controls are only temporary palliatives and sooner or later they create such hardship and malallocation of resources that they must be removed. They are completely artificial and incompatible with a free competitive system in which prices are allowed to adjust, in the marketplace, to demand and supply. They lead to black markets, bureaucracy, and a great deal of waste of effort. Some further tax increase, in my opinion, is preferable to price controls as a means of avoiding inflation.

I suggest that study be given, if price rises continue, to the imposition of further excise taxes upon goods which are competing for scarce resources with our defense efforts. Such taxes would both drain off inflationary dollars, and reduce the demand for scarce commodities. They would not interfere directly in the free play of market forces. They would not affect those sectors of the economy not related to the defense effort. They would not require changes in the wage-price guideline formula.

Voluntary guidelines, in the long run, are not a substitute for wise and responsible fiscal policy which give the marketplace full play. I hope this Congress will give further attention to the implementation of sound fiscal policy, so that the role of direct and indirect controls can be minimized, and sooner, rather than later, completely eliminated.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1966, I wrote to Hon. John W. Bush, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, expressing my concern over the serious boxcar shortage existing in the Nation and the recent car distribution order issued by the Commission directing the Southern Railway System to turn over 350 boxcars each week to Western railroads to relieve boxcar shortages in the West.

Chairman Bush replied to my letter on February 23, 1966. The text of his letter is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1966.
Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITENER: This will acknowledge of your letter dated February 17, 1966, protesting Commission car distribution directions as contributing to boxcar shortages in the East.

The ownership of plain boxcars by U.S. class I carriers is inadequate to meet the demands of the shipping public. From January 1, 1956, to date, the available supply of this type of equipment has been reduced by more than 190,000 cars; and there continues to be in excess of 2,000 plain boxcar retirements per month over replacements. The shortage of this equipment is not limited to one area, but exists in most sections of the country. The Commission has no authority to require carriers to purchase new equipment or to repair unserviceable equipment. The Commission does have the responsibility, however, to maintain an equitable distribution of the available supply of cars.

The Commission has in effect several car distribution directions designed to move empty plain serviceable boxcars, with inside length less than 44 feet 8 inches and doors less than 8 feet wide, to areas in greatest distress for this type of equipment. More than 20 railroads are affected by these directions, and most of them are cooperating with the Commission in an effort to alleviate a shortage which currently is reported as in excess of 10,000 boxcars per day and where in some sections of the country shippers are being deprived of sufficient cars to meet 50 percent of requirements.

The carriers located in the eastern and southern districts as a group indicate that they have in excess of 100 percent of plain boxcar ownership on line. The northwestern district of the country is currently attempting to operate with 76 percent of ownership on line.

I am sure that you appreciate the fact that the Commission must be ever alert to the national requirements. However, the car situation will be closely watched, and any adjustments will be made which are deemed necessary to assure everyone his fair share of the available car supply.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. BUSH,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the information that he has given me confirms the statements I made in the House on February 22, 1966.

The critical boxcar shortage in the Nation cannot be relieved through distribution service orders or by an increase in the fee one railroad must pay another railroad for the use of its freight equipment.

The problem can be solved only by an accelerated program of boxcar construction. It is a serious problem affecting the economy of the Nation and the national defense. The Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the railroads should give immediate attention to the situation.

WASHINGTON'S NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and appalled this morning when I opened the Washington Post and discovered that the Federal Aviation Agency is contemplating spending \$150 million of the taxpayers' money to turn the Washington National Airport into a jet-age airport.

Now, I am just as much in favor of modern air travel as anyone else in this country. And I believe firmly that our airport facilities should be constantly updated and upgraded to make way for improved air service.

But the facts surrounding the FAA's sudden compulsion to make National Airport a field for jet-age travel are curious indeed.

It has been only a few weeks, now, since the FAA suddenly announced that it would allow two- and three-engine jets to land and take off at National. That decision came as a surprise to many people, I know—particularly those who live in the highly congested, built-up residential sections around National Airport.

Such a decision may or may not have seemed justified to the FAA, based on the research facilities it has been using.

But the present announcement is another matter entirely.

Let us look at some figures. Let us look at the background.

Dulles International Airport was first opened to the public in 1962. Ever since that time the rate of traffic for the two airports has been just about the same—the airlines and their passengers use National Airport by a 9 to 1—or better—margin.

In the year ending in December 1963, there were 12,074 departures in scheduled service from Dulles compared to 98,432 from Washington National. The following year the ratio was 10,887 for Dulles to 96,520 at National.

In the 12-month period ending June 30 last year there were a total of 10,633 departures from Dulles compared to 97,556 from National.

Here we are with what is admittedly one of the world's greatest, most modern, and most architecturally impressive and beautiful airports—Dulles International—within a short drive of our Nation's Capital. And it is being bypassed by air traffic and we are being told that we must spend another \$150 million to make Washington National bigger, better, and more modern.

What justification is there for this? Dulles is a masterpiece of construction. Is it, also, a white elephant?

It cost the American taxpayers \$119,200,000 to open Dulles to the public in 1962—\$108 million for the terminal, hangars, and runways and another \$11,200,000 for access roads to Interstate Route 495.

It cost the taxpayers \$38,779,709 to open Washington National Airport to the public on June 16, 1941, and make the systematic improvements to it which have been needed in the years since that time.

The most fantastic comparison I have seen thus far, however, has to do with the cost of operating the two airports annually.

Dulles, with only 10,633 departures in the last 12-month period, cost the taxpayers and users a total of \$3,984,298. At Washington National the cost was \$3,258,447—and National served nearly 10 times as many flights as Dulles did in the same time period.

There seems to be little justification for the FAA's sudden determination to glut Washington National with a massive influx and outflow of high-speed jet travel. I, for one, am deeply disturbed by this announcement. And I suspect that a large number of my distinguished colleagues in this body are, also.

While we do everything we can to keep our airport facilities abreast of modern change, we must, at the same time, keep the safety and welfare of the citizens who live in this densely populated region in and around Washington uppermost in our minds.

The FAA's front-page headlines this morning do not indicate that this Agency is mindful of the dual responsibilities it bears by law to the traveling public and those who live near airport facilities. Unless it can do both, it should contemplate a good deal more carefully before it rushes into print.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD INTEREST RATE HIKE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I oppose inflation and would do everything in my power to resist it because inflation hurts the average consumer, the little man, most of all. But inquiries have been coming into my office from my home district, San Antonio, relating to the general tightening up of money since

the Federal Reserve Board voted by a bare 4-to-3 majority last December to hike the discount rate. It seems to these people, and to many others, that the action of the Federal Reserve Board has created a good deal of inflation this year.

Now, these inquiries are very disturbing to me because they clearly show the ill effects of the interest rate hike, and they are difficult to answer. I wonder therefore whether the Federal Reserve Board members who voted for the discount rate hike will help me satisfactorily explain to the homebuyer in San Antonio why he now has to pay 6 percent interest on a federally insured home mortgage loan? How can I explain to the homebuilder why his sick industry will probably grow sicker this year, while other industries enjoy record profits? How can I explain to the unemployed and underemployed carpenter, bricklayer, electrician, and others in the sick homebuilding industry that their plight is the direct result of recommendations made by a handful of bankers and adopted by a 4-to-3 vote of the Federal Reserve Board, and that there is nothing that I can do or that any other elected official can do to reverse the decisions of those bankers?

These are all valid questions, and they demand answers. For my part, those few who constantly argue for higher interest rates, and who now are insisting on removing the 4¼-percent interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds are either unusually selfish or unusually dense.

ESTONIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 48th anniversary of Estonia's proclamation of independence as a democratic republic. Since that important event occurred, the history of this gallant people has been replete with both progress and setbacks, but the lesson of history is that although Estonia is today under the oppressive thumb of the Soviet Union, there is hope that this, too, will pass.

A mere 9 months and 4 days after declaring her independence, Estonia was attacked by Soviet Russia. This attack occurred only 13 days after Russia had declared that all peoples of the former Czarist Russia were free to secede from Lenin's "new Russia."

Again in February—February 2, 1920—after having repelled the Communist invaders for 14 months, Estonia succeeded in signing a peace treaty with Russia, and in September 1921, she was admitted to the League of Nations.

An armed coup d'etat by Communist groups on December 1, 1924, failed of success, and later investigations disclosed that the Soviet Union initiated

the plan and had infiltrated the leaders of the uprising and a large number of fighters and arms into Estonia.

Democracy flourished in Estonia until September 1939, when the Soviet Union, threatening war as an alternative, forced upon that brave nation a mutual assistance treaty under which Estonia was compelled to establish a number of Russian naval and air force bases on her territory.

The following June, the Soviet Union presented to Estonia an ultimatum demanding establishment of a new government friendly to the Soviet Union and granting of free passage to additional Soviet troops. The next day—June 17, 1940—Soviet troops marched into an occupied Estonia. On June 21, a puppet government was imposed on Estonia by Moscow. To complete this annexation, Russia admitted Estonia into the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union as a Union Republic, and a Communist constitution was adopted by the Estonian puppet government on August 25, 1940.

From that day to this, Estonia has suffered under the Russian Communist yoke, but that gallant nation has never reconciled herself to the status of a Soviet colony. Therefore, today, Estonians in their homeland and those of Estonian birth and their descendants here and elsewhere in the free world, reiterate the hope that history will, indeed, repeat itself and Estonia will soon again join hands with the free nations of the world.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE POOR AS TEACHERS' AIDS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 89-10

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will exempt the earnings of poor people employed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act from consideration as part of this income or resources under the public assistance laws.

We have very correctly made an exemption for certain earnings of public assistance recipients before. Poor persons hired under the Economic Opportunity Act do not have to count part of their income under that act in determining their eligibility for public assistance. Thus, a mother on AFDC can work part time under an antipoverty program without it resulting in a deduction of her welfare payment.

This is sensible for two main reasons. This gives an incentive to the welfare recipient to accept part-time employment through the education aid program and thereby learn skills which may lead to eventual full-time employment and self-sufficiency. The second reason this exemption should be made is that we would merely be taking Federal funds out of one Federal account to place it back into

another Federal account with no benefit to the individual employed.

I was most impressed by the statements submitted by Sargent Shriver to the ad hoc subcommittee on the war on poverty last April 30. He recounted the great advantages of employing the poor in these programs. Let me quote him:

The employment of the poor in jobs other than menial ones is a significant way of securing their participation in the program. Positions such as health aides and teacher aides represent new career opportunities in fields which have previously been reserved for those with college training. They represent a new avenue of hope for the poor at the same time that they assist the trained professional—the registered nurse or teacher, for example—in increasing his effectiveness. In addition, the poor who fill these jobs can provide an important means of communication between the impoverished and the rest of the community. They can help community action agencies to be responsive to the real needs of the poor.

What Sargent Shriver has said about the poor participating in the Economic Opportunity Act certainly applies also for their participation in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs. Title I is aimed at helping the schools and the schoolchildren in less prosperous areas of the city or State. We should encourage the mothers and older children in these areas to accept employment knowing that it will not result in an immediate reduction in their welfare aid.

That is the aim of H.R. 13073.

The language of my bill is almost identical to the exemption included in Title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act.

I hope there will be broad support for this reform.

H.R. 13073

A bill to amend title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, to provide that payments received thereunder shall be disregarded for certain public assistance purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

"Sec. 213. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall provide that—

"(1) the first \$85 plus one-half of the excess over \$85 of payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under this title or any program assisted under this title shall not be regarded (A) as income or resources of such person in determining his need under such approved State plan, or (B) as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan; and

"(2) no payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under this title or any such program shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan except to the extent made available to or for the benefit of such other individual.

"(b) No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under titles I, IV, X, XIV, or

XVI of the Social Security Act for any period before the first month beginning after the adjournment of a State's first regular legislative session which adjourns after the date of enactment of this section shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of subsection (a)."

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, during our consideration of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, I voted for the motion to recommit and against final passage of the bill.

I should like to state that while I favored many aspects of the measure, such as the graduated withholding rates, quarterly payments by the self-employed of their estimated social security tax, and an increase in the percentage of tax to be paid currently through withholding, estimated tax payments or both, I felt compelled to vote against the bill because of the provisions relating to excise taxes on automobiles and especially telephone service.

I recognize the validity of the argument that adjustments must be made if the budget is to be kept as nearly in balance as possible and if we are to keep our commitments in Vietnam.

On the other hand, the Excise Tax Reduction Act has been in effect approximately 8 months. It would seem to me that the budget and defense experts in the administration should have been aware of the fact that we had, last June, a costly commitment in Vietnam which would require additional funds, and they should have planned accordingly. Quite frankly, I believe that there was poor planning on the part of those experts.

I feel that it was wrong to reduce these taxes last year if it was known that a large proportion of those taxes would have to be reinstated within 8 months; and if the budget and defense experts, who recommended and supported the tax cuts, did not honestly know this last year, we need a reexamination of the personnel, policies, and procedures involved to see if we can come up with more realistic forecasts. I do not think it is fair to the American taxpayer to reduce a portion of his taxes and then within less than a year restore them either by design or poor judgment.

For that reason I voted against the bill. I am hopeful that in the future our budget and defense experts will be able to project into the future better than they have in this instance.

SENATOR PAT McNAMARA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the vast majority of my constituents, when I say that it was with the greatest regret and personal sadness that I learned that the great senior Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA, will retire at the end of this year.

PAT McNAMARA has been an outstanding servant of the people of Michigan; he has been a respected and beloved legislator; he has been, to many of my colleagues, and to me, a valued mentor. In the 12 years that PAT McNAMARA has served his State and his country, he has been a driving force behind some of the most important social legislation of the century: Hospital and health care for the elderly, aid to education, civil rights, and the first concerted Federal efforts to fight poverty.

As the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, he has been responsible for programs that are helping to provide thousands of cities and towns with capital improvements that are soon translated into new jobs and improved health and welfare. This is the proud legacy that PAT McNAMARA will leave our Nation when he retires next January.

After a lifetime of dedicated service, first as a leader in trade unionism and then in public service, PAT deserves to be able to ease up a bit. I wish him well in his retirement; but the Michigan congressional delegation and the people of Michigan will miss his leadership in the coming years.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that this afternoon when one vote came on a quorum call and another on adoption of the rule on the foreign aid bill I was with Dr. Irving Muskat, chairman of Interama, in conference with the Honorable John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, relative to some vital aspects of Interama and was not able to get back in time for these votes. However, I have, of course, voted on the other votes respecting the foreign aid bill, including final passage of the bill today.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT 14TH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a strong believer in the power of prayer, I was deeply moved, as were others present, by the remarks of President Lyndon B. Johnson at the 14th annual President's prayer breakfast meeting, held last Thursday, February 17.

Burdened by the weight of decision-making demanded by his high office, and having to make decisions calling for sending of American young men into the battlefields of Vietnam, our President stated that he has found the courage to face the next day in prayer. He quoted the words of another tormented President of a past generation, Abraham Lincoln:

I have been driven to my knees many times by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seem insufficient for the day.

President Johnson added that his strength comes not only from his own prayers, but also from the prayers of the mothers who have given their sons to our country, and who in their great sorrow still found the courage to write him and to pray for him. The President was preceded by the world renowned evangelist, the Reverend Dr. Billy Graham.

Mr. Speaker, in the hope that those who did not hear the president may gain a better understanding of the heart and mind of our great leader by a reading of the complete text of his moving and inspiring remarks made on February 17, 1966, at the 14th annual President's prayer breakfast held at the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 14TH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, FEBRUARY 17, 1966

Dr. Graham, my beloved friend, Senator CARLSON, distinguished guests at the head table, my dear friends, I am pleased to return again to our annual prayer breakfast to be among so many of my old friends. In this room this morning we have been privileged to hear one of the great speakers and leaders of our time. He has been heard by some of the great leaders of the most powerful nations in the world, yet not a single one of us is ashamed to say, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help."

Just a few blocks from here, on the front of the National Archives, is an inscription, "The past is prologue." As your President, I have had many occasions to realize the truth of that statement. Throughout our long history our Presidents have struggled with recurring problems. The way they handle those problems and their successes or failures can guide us in the actions that we are called upon to take today.

But there are some things that history cannot teach us and among them is how to bear, without pain, the sending of our young Americans into battle and how to fill the aching void as we wait for the news of their fate and how to console the wife, or the mother, or the little children when that news is bad.

These are the times when I recall the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln when he said, "I have been driven to my knees many times by the overwhelming conviction that I had

nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seem insufficient for the day." In private prayer at unusual moments, I have found courage to meet another day in a world where peace upon earth is still only an empty dream.

The Prophet Isaiah tells us, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint."

I believe that with all my heart, but in these troubled times I am sustained by much more than my own prayers. I am sustained by the prayers of hundreds of Americans who daily take the time to look up from their own problems in order to try to give me a little encouragement in mine. Not long ago I received a letter one morning from a mother whose son had been killed in Vietnam. She spoke of the pain and the loss and the tears that are ever ready to flow, but through all of this were words of encouragement for me from this dear little lady.

In her letter she concluded, "Mr. President, I wish I could tell you all that I feel in my heart. There just aren't words, so we ask God to bless you and your little family, that He will guide you in all the terrible decisions that you must make. As long as we believe, our strength is in our faith in God and He will never fail us."

My countrymen, in those words from that dear mother are to be found the greatness of this Nation and also the strength of its President.

FINANCING OF WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the fine explanation of H.R. 12752 provided by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and I appreciate his appeal for our support of its enactment.

I likewise appreciate the very pointed admonitions set forth by the ranking minority Member the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. It is heartwarming to know that an issue as vital as the financing of the war in Vietnam has such bipartisan support. However, I also agree with my colleagues who feel most strongly that this is, at least to some degree, discriminatory legislation.

Last June we removed the excise tax on many, many items, including a partial removal of the excise tax on automobiles and telephone charges. It occurs to me that we might have turned to the more luxury-type area to reimpose the excise tax. A tax on luxury items is certainly not one that touches the impoverished or the workingman. I concede also that the machinery is still in operation for collecting the excise tax on automobiles and telephones, and for that reason, it seems most appropriate that this be the area, though I reluctantly agree, where additional revenue must be found.

We all loathe the war and none can deny that we are now engaged in a cruel war in Vietnam. Our servicemen dare not be denied the implements of war or the necessities for their subsistence, but

since we are now engaged in this involvement I find no recourse except to approve the proposed Tax Adjustment Act of 1966.

I do so with the hope that in a very brief period of time we can restore these tax cuts and that the additional costs of warfare will be lifted from the backs of our taxpayers. While making this necessary adjustment now, I agree most wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], that we need to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures for domestic purposes—and such eliminations can be made. However, those who are suffering from inadequate economic resources today, those who have been disadvantaged by years of economic drought as many of the inhabitants of the Appalachia region, should not be made to suffer the first expenditure cuts. Wise expenditures of aid for these areas will help to replenish the Treasury in the future and improve income.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly express approval of the legislation in the hope that what we do here today, out of prudence, will provide assurances for victory in Vietnam.

THE REDWOODS DESERVE BETTER THAN COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on conservation, delivered yesterday, is one of the most far-reaching and farsighted on this subject, of all time. The President is to be highly commended for his generally excellent program, and particularly on his proposals to combat water pollution.

California's Governor Brown deserves credit for his efforts leading to the inclusion of a Redwood National Park in this program and for his work to secure provision of appropriate economic adjustment payments.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than candid or honest if I were to say the administration's redwood proposal is adequate to preserve this great and unique resource. Unfortunately, it falls far short of what is necessary if any meaningful stands of redwoods are to be preserved for future generations of Americans.

It takes a thousand years or more to grow mature redwoods, and, once cut, much longer still to establish a climax forest, if indeed that is possible at all. This point, incidentally, is not the opinion of novices or special-interest representatives. This point was made by the National Park Service in its report of September 1964, prophetically entitled "The Redwoods, a National Opportunity for Conservation."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the administration's bill would appear to ignore this very message. It appears to disregard the simple but staggering fact that only 10 percent—or 200,000 acres—of this country's original redwood forest remains today. It appears to ignore the reality that last year alone some 15,000 acres of redwood giants fell to the woodman's ax, and that more are being felled—many in

the very area proposed for preservation—as we talk.

These facts plainly indicate that bold action is required, but bold action does not characterize the administration's plan.

This plan calls for a 43,392-acre park in the Mill Creek area of Del Norte County, including the present Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast State Parks. But when these State parks are included, only some 25,000 acres would be added to protected status; only 7,800 acres of additional virgin redwoods would be included, and much of this is either of mediocre quality or in the process of being cut.

This Mill Creek area is primarily important as watershed protection for the two existing State parks. It would not compare in quality or variety, in scenic or recreational features, with the 90,000-acre park at Redwood and Prairie Creeks which 28 of our colleagues in the House have joined me in calling for, and which 16 Members of the Senate introduced yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I am also disturbed about the plan to provide a separate unit of 1,400 acres in Humboldt County to protect the world's tallest trees. It is not that these trees do not need protection; they need it desperately. But this provision of only 1,400 acres raises false hopes that they could be preserved for long. Once the surrounding valley slopes are logged off, as they inevitably will be, the tallest redwoods will be exposed to wind and flood and soil erosion which will quickly number their years.

The most serious weakness in the administration's proposal, however, Mr. Speaker, is the omission of the Redwood and Prairie Creek Valleys, where sweeping vistas combine with primeval forest and wild, clear streams in a setting of unmatched grandeur. Here nearly 80,000 acres of unprotected forests are available, 33,000 of which are forested with virgin redwoods.

This is the area originally identified as most desirable for a redwood national park in a National Geographic Society study.

This is the area first recommended by the National Park Service.

This is the area for a redwood park supported by the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the National Audubon Society, the National Parks Association, the Men's Garden Clubs of America, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the Nature Conservancy, Trustees for Conservation, Citizens for a Redwood National Park, and the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

This is the area provided for in bills introduced by 45 Members of the House and Senate.

It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that insufficient funds presently exist to acquire this entire area of primary desirability. But the answer to this limitation is not to put the limited funds available to second best use.

The answer is that if only \$56 million is available, it should be put to use in buying the best land available; \$56 million can make a very desirable start in acquiring an outstanding Redwood National Park in the Redwood Creek area,

though certainly an even more desirable one could be purchased with more plentiful funds. And if we begin in the right place we can make appropriate additions as this becomes possible.

Compromise is not worthy of this great resource. Let us pursue its preservation with the vision, imagination and determination it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times this morning, in an editorial entitled, "Retreat on Redwoods," comments thoughtfully and perceptively on this very problem. I commend it to our colleagues' attention:

RETREAT ON REDWOODS

In his message on conservation yesterday, President Johnson put forward an excellent program to combat water pollution, on which we will comment later, and he reaffirmed his support for several desirable bills now pending for national parks and seashores.

But on one of the most controversial of current issues in this field—the size of the proposed Redwood National Park in northern California—his stand is a sharp disappointment.

For some months the administration has been wavering between two plans. One, embodied in a bill by Representative COHELAN, of California, would establish a 90,000-acre park. More than a score of House Members have introduced similar bills. The alternative plan drafted within the Interior Department provided for a drastically smaller park. It would have afforded no protection to Redwood Creek Valley, which has the best surviving stand of primeval redwoods. But it would have been much more acceptable to the commercial interests that want to saw these ancient trees—some of them more than 2,000 years old—into lumber for use as building material, fenceposts, and similar purposes.

Public protests against this timidly conceived, grossly inadequate plan led to the last-minute compromise which the administration sent to Congress yesterday. It is a compromise that will satisfy no one who understands the values at stake in the preservation for all time of these unique, magnificent trees. We note with surprise and regret that Senator KUCHEL, of California, has agreed to sponsor this highly unsatisfactory bill, and with even more surprise and regret that Secretary Udall lends his reputation as a conservationist to such an unworthy compromise.

Only 43,000 acres are to be included in this proposed park. Since this acreage includes two existing State parks, little more than half of the land would be newly protected. Moreover, fewer than 7,000 acres would consist of primeval redwoods. The Redwood Creek Valley would remain available for private exploitation—except for one pathetically small enclosure of 1,400 acres, isolated from the rest of the park.

Buying up these redwood lands from private owners would be expensive, but dollars cannot be decisive when the asset is irreplaceable. As President Johnson so eloquently said in his message, "Despite all of our wealth and knowledge, we cannot create a redwood forest, a wild river, or a gleaming seashore." We urge Congress to take the President at his word and to create a Redwood National Park worthy of his rhetoric and of the great trees that are an indescribably beautiful part of America's natural heritage.

"END MEASLES" CAMPAIGN IN RHODE ISLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in its recent "end measles" campaign, the Rhode Island Medical Society's Child School Health Committee and the Rhode Island State Department of Health took dead aim on one of this Nation's deadliest killers and cripples—measles—in an effort to remove this mortal threat to our children from the State scene.

The entire State has been lavish in its commendation of the medical profession for recognizing and publicizing the critical need that exists for extensive vaccination of children against measles, and for its outstanding cooperation and personal involvement in this statewide public health program.

Both Dr. Rudolf A. Jaworski, chairman of the medical society's child school health committee, and Dr. James E. Bowes, chief of the epidemiology division of the State department of health are to be congratulated for the splendid manner in which they organized and operated this program.

But I wish to pay special tribute to the more than 300 doctors and 500 nurses who volunteered their services—many at great personal sacrifice—and gave so generously of their time to conduct the "end measles" clinics, and to do the job right, as expressed by the campaign's motto, "Once and for All."

The clinics were a huge success, despite the heaviest snowstorm of the year. Perhaps the real unsung heroes were the parents whose ingenuity led to the use of almost every known means of transportation in bringing their children to the clinics for vaccination. And I must not overlook the many couriers who battled the elements in rushing supplies of vaccine from central depots to outlying clinics.

Rhode Island is also indebted to the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service. From their regional office in Boston, they provided professional assistance when the campaign was being planned; and they provided a number of high-pressure jet-injectors for administering the vaccine and qualified personnel to operate them when the children were being vaccinated. CDC will also conduct a follow-up survey, contacting numerous Rhode Island physicians who were involved in the campaign, to obtain meaningful data on relative reaction rates. Doubtless, the Public Health Service will report to the Nation the possibilities indicated from Rhode Island's campaign.

As a result of this statewide immunization program, the end of measles among the present generation of Rhode Island children is in sight and State planning for the future is on a firm and sure basis.

I am extremely proud that Rhode Island's "end measles" campaign was reported in a recent issue of *Time*. But there is a story behind the story that appeared in *Time* that tells why my home State was ready for a statewide vaccination program at this particular time.

Even before Rhode Island planned its statewide vaccination program, there

was evidence in the State that measles was no longer to be considered as one of those childhood phases nearly every youngster has to go through.

Relatively few citizens across this land have ever heard of a small community in Rhode Island called Burrillville; but when measles finally joins polio, smallpox, and diphtheria on the list of diseases modern medicine has virtually eliminated, Burrillville will assume its proper position. Because, in the fight against measles, Burrillville has already achieved a kind of immortality as the first community in the country to conduct a townwide measles clinic.

Its first clinic was held early in 1963 and was followed by another clinic later that year. Its third clinic was held in February of 1965 and a fourth was conducted last October.

So when Burrillville joined this year's statewide "end measles" campaign, it was actually holding its fifth measles clinic.

Great credit is due Dr. Ernest J. Smith of Burrillville, who pioneered these anti-measles clinics, and to his corps of helpers from the Burrillville-Glocester District Nursing Association. "Without their help it would not have been possible," Dr. Smith has said, adding that the particular procedure used in Burrillville involved hard work, and that it was successful only because of the fine cooperation of the local nursing association. In this regard, I am not only proud as a citizen of the State of Rhode Island, proud to represent its people in the Congress, but I am also proud from a familial standpoint: My sister, Margaret Fogarty, serves as the supervisor of the Burrillville-Glocester District Nursing Association.

Thankfully, their efforts were publicized in various medical journals and served as an inspiration for other communities to adopt similar programs.

The effectiveness of the Burrillville campaign may be gaged by one statistic: During last year's measles epidemic in Rhode Island, when more than 2,000 cases were reported throughout the State, Burrillville escaped with 4 cases—and none of those who contracted the disease had been inoculated by Dr. Smith.

Great oaks can grow from little acorns. The immunization program that began in the small town of Burrillville was later adopted and proved to be successful on a statewide basis. One need not go far afield to project a nationwide undertaking with equal success in stamping out once and for all this deadly disease.

The American public must be made to realize that measles has become one of the principal child killers today, and that each year new thousands of children develop pneumonia and other serious diseases from measles. Even when fatality does not result, measles leaves in its wake permanent brain damage and a host of behavioral and emotional problems.

National morbidity and mortality records show that some 500 children die annually from measles, and that approximately 4,000 children develop en-

cephalitis and must spend the rest of their lives in homes for the mentally retarded.

This situation can be remedied. Medical research has already shown us how to prevent this kind of tragedy. The Journal of the American Medical Association, commenting editorially, has stated:

With the development of a safe and effective vaccine, * * * measles and its complications can be virtually eliminated. All that is needed is wide acceptance and diligent use of the available vaccine.

By responding to the expressed will of the American people that good health is no longer the privilege of some, but the right of all our citizens, and by enacting so many key health measures to that end, the first session of this Congress won the designation of the "Health Congress." To live up to that reputation, we can do no less than to move promptly and swiftly to make certain that appropriate measures are taken in our home States to insure the ultimate defeat of measles as a killer andcrippler of children.

If Rhode Island, the Nation's smallest State—and I hasten to remind you that this applies only to its geographical area—if Rhode Island can produce heroes and heroines for a statewide campaign to end measles, it behooves all of our States to move in the same direction.

I feel that within many State borders there are other Dr. Ernest J. Smiths—physicians with true pioneer blood—who need only the encouragement of their communities to try something big and new.

Surely, each State has its Dr. Rudolf A. Jaworski and its Dr. James E. Bowes, ready, willing, and eager to mount a similar campaign.

Certainly, there are other nurses whose measure of dedication equals that of my sister—Margaret Fogarty—able to insure the cooperation between local nurses and local doctors for other statewide "end measles" campaigns.

And, finally, given the facts and the reason why, no American citizen can find it in his or her heart to say "No" to workers in such a humanitarian cause.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for Thursday, February 24 through March 4, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RONCALIO, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOGARTY, for 15 minutes, today.

CXII—257—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. REUSS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN in two instances.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. WIDNALL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOWDY.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. MULTER.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. NEDZI.

Mr. McGRATH.

Mr. BURKE.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. MORRISON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 28, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (2 U.S.C. 25), approved February 18, 1948: THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, 17th District, New York.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2086. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report of need for improvement in supply support for aircraft under the military assistant program for the Republic of China; Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2087. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2088. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for postaward audits to detect lack of disclosure of significant cost or pricing data available prior to contract negotiation and award, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2089. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on employee personal property claims settled during calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of sections 240-242, title 31, U.S.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2090. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 6, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Washburn Harbor, Wisconsin, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

2091. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the status of construction, alteration, or acquisition of public buildings authorized, pursuant to the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 610(a); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12322. A bill to enable cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion to improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for, cotton; with amendments (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 13037. A bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expending, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 13038. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 13039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment, for purposes of the Federal income tax, of the sale or exchange of livestock on account of an adverse weather condition or certain disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13040. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the

acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 13041. A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13042. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 13043. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13044. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to impose an import tax on electricity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13045. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 13046. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 13047. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13048. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 13049. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 13050. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13051. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13052. A bill to establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Center to promote research and development activities for highway traffic safety, to provide financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13053. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 13054. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 13055. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13056. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 13057. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 13058. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 13059. A bill to govern further development of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 13060. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 13061. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13062. A bill to amend the Act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for certain members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 13063. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize a limited experimental program of insurance for mortgages executed by nonprofit organizations to finance the purchase and rehabilitation of deteriorating or substandard housing for subsequent sale to low-income purchasers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13064. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 13065. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 13066. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 13067. A bill to amend the joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day (37 U.S.C. 157) to provide appropriate recognition of the pledge of allegiance to the flag and its author, Francis Bellamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 13068. A bill authorizing the establishment of meteorological observation stations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 13069. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 13070. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13071. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 13072. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien sons and daughters of World War I veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13073. A bill to amend title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to provide that payments received thereunder shall be disregarded for certain public assistance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 13074. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the historic home in the Nation's Capital of Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury under President Thomas Jefferson and President James Madison, as an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, and to provide for its preservation as a historic building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13076. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 13077. A bill to provide for the construction of wells and other facilities necessary to provide a supplemental water supply to the lands of the Mirage Flats Irrigation District, Mirage Flats project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 13078. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13079. A bill to promote the integration of education in the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 13080. A bill to amend the act of January 21, 1929, as it relates to the methods by which certain lands held for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska may be sold, leased, or exchanged; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13081. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain individuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13082. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for

a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 13083. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER of Mississippi:

H.R. 13084. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the U.S. aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 13085. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, to provide that an individual under a total disability for 2 months shall be considered "disabled" for benefit and freeze purposes even though the disability is not permanent, and to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 13086. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 13087. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 13089. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13090. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 13091. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 849. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 850. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Representative Government Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Con. Res. 596. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 748. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 749. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by

House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 13092. A bill for the relief of William F. Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13093. A bill for the relief of Grady Benefield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13094. A bill for the relief of Chris G. Ings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 13095. A bill for the relief of Henry Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H.R. 13096. A bill for the relief of Monte H. Walker; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 13097. A bill for the relief of Hillary Lockhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 13098. A bill for the relief of the survivors of Justin E. Burton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13099. A bill for the relief of Ismay Emeline Benn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 13100. A bill for the relief of George Andreopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 13101. A bill for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

334. The SPEAKER presented a petition of John L. Purcell, Los Angeles, Calif., and others, relative to a pension for veterans of World War I, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fino Introduces GOP Demonstration Cities Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation designed to focus attention on part two of the administration's plan to socialize American residential patterns—the "Federal coordinator" called for in the administration's "demonstration cities" legislation.

My bill, in many ways similar to the "demonstration cities" legislation introduced by the administration, contains similar program and financial provisions, but deletes the section calling for a Federal coordinator and substitutes a Federal information officer. The bill also deletes language requiring cities to have a plan for social renovation before they

can qualify for Federal aid. The bill adds a provision stating the sense of Congress that the program is not to detract in any way from the powers of local government to control and administer existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

This legislation—substituting a Federal information officer for a Federal coordinator—to my mind removes the Federal fishhook from the self-improvement carrot the President is offering to the cities of our Nation. I believe in billions for rebuilding our cities, but I do not believe in spending a cent for the undermining of local government.

I do not believe that Federal aid programs should be the vehicle of social experiments. My bill cuts the "social experiment" angle out of the program. I believe in creative federalism and I support that part of the administration bill encompassed in my bill. I am 100 percent opposed, however, to encroaching centralism as represented by the Federal coordinator, whom I call a commissar for he would be nothing less. My bill is a good bill. It is truly dedicated to re-

building our cities in accordance with the timeless American tradition of local self-government. The Fino bill takes the encroaching centralism out of the program and leaves the creative federalism. I believe that this is the way to do the job.

Chester W. Nimitz: An American Naval Immortal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 4 days before his 81st birthday, Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz died. This Nation, and especially the hundreds of thousands of American servicemen who served under him, now